

SENATE.

FRIDAY, February 4, 1921.

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 2, 1921.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

QUAPAW INDIAN LANDS.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business for the purpose of taking up the bill (S. 4879) to amend section 1 of the act of Congress approved March 2, 1895 (28 Stat. L., p. 907), to extend restrictions against the alienation of lands allotted to and inherited by certain Quapaw Indians, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McCUMBER. I shall not object at this time unless it leads to debate.

Mr. CURTIS. I call up the bill at the request of the Senators from Oklahoma. It is a bill to extend the time of the restrictions which now exist against the alienation of certain Quapaw Indian lands. The bill has been read in full, and the amendments of the Committee on Indian Affairs have been read. The bill is recommended by the Department of the Interior and favorably reported by the committee. The Senators from Oklahoma are very anxious to have it passed; otherwise great harm may come to those incompetent Indians.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I hope that the bill may be passed without delay.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments of the committee will be stated.

The first amendment was, on page 2, in line 2, after the word "Interior," to strike out the words "as set forth in the House of Representatives Document No. — (66th Cong., 3d. sess.)," and to insert:

To wit: John Beaver, Mah-hunk-a-zhe-ka, now Beaver; Anna Beaver, now Bear; Arthur Buffalo, Lizzie Cedar, Peter Clabber, Minnie Greenback, now Clabber, Harry Crawfish, Thomas Crawfish, Mary Crawfish, now Skye; Francis Quapaw Goodeagle, Wat-tah-nah-zhe Goodeagle, Khah-Daah, or Grandeagle, now Quapaw; Antoine Greenback, Joseph Greenback, Ho-gom-me, or Goodeagle; Mis-kah-get-tah, Amos Newhouse, John Quapaw, Nellie J. Ball, now Quapaw; Ta-mee-heh, or Quapaw; Benjamin Quapaw, Solomon Quapaw, Frances Quapaw, now Gokey; Julia Stafford, now Shapp; Hah-dah-ska-tun-ka, or Track; Mes-kah-tun-ka, or Track, now Slagle; Flora Young Greenback, now Whitebird; James Xavier, Anna Xavier, now Collins; Wah-she-mah-tah-net Track, now Martha Track Quapaw; Henry Buffalo, Clara May Buffalo, Hazel L. Buffalo, now McDunneer; Nora Buffalo, now Brook; William Buffalo, James Amos Valliere; Georgia Alice Valliere, now Hampton; Iva Amelia Valliere, Jesse Daylight, Clayton C. Daylight, Emma Louise Blansett, Alphonso Greenback, Jr., Lulu May Greenback, Mary Mollie Greenback, Amy Greenback, Woodrow Wilson Greenback, John Greenback, Alphonso Greenback, sr., Beatrice C. Peters, now Shapp; Juanita Alma Dawes, Agnes Track, Dennis Wilson, Erwin Wilson, Martin Wilson, Mary Wilson, Louise Wilson, Robert A. Whitebird, Helene Irene Whitebird, Thomas Xavier, Elnora Quapaw, and Lucy Lottson Beaver.

So as to read:

That section 1 of the act of Congress approved March 2, 1895 (28 Stat. L., p. 907), in so far as the same relates to the allotments of land to the Quapaw Indians and to restrictions against alienation of said allotments, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to provide that the restrictions which now exist against the alienation of the lands allotted to and allotted lands inherited by the Quapaw Indians named in the letter of January —, 1921, of the Secretary of the Interior, to wit, John Beaver, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 9, before the word "years," to strike out the word "ten" and insert the word "twenty-five," so as to read:

The same are hereby extended for the further and additional period of 25 years from the date of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMERGENCY TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 2, line 1, strike out the figure "30" and insert in lieu thereof "40," so as to read:

Wheat, 40 cents per bushel.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 2, line 13, after the word "pound," insert the words "except rice cleaned for use in the manufacture of canned foods," so as to read:

Rice, cleaned, 2 cents per pound, except rice cleaned for use in the manufacture of canned foods.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 3, after line 13, insert:

14. Fresh or frozen beef, veal, mutton, lamb, and pork, 2 cents per pound. Meats of all kinds, prepared or preserved, not specially provided for herein, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I understood that we had up the Quapaw Indian bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That bill has been passed. The bill now before the Senate is the so-called emergency tariff bill.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Harris	McCormick	Smith, Ga.
Borah	Harrison	McCumber	Smoot
Brandagee	Hefflin	McLean	Spencer
Calder	Johnson, Calif.	McNary	Sutherland
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Moses	Thomas
Culberson	Kellogg	Nelson	Townsend
Curtis	Kendrick	New	Trammell
Dial	Kenyon	Overman	Underwood
Dillingham	Keyes	Page	Wadsworth
Elkins	King	Pomerene	Walsh, Mass.
France	Kirby	Ransdell	Warren
Gay	Knox	Reed	Williams
Gooding	La Follette	Sheppard	Willis
Gore	Lenroot	Shields	
Gronna	Lodge	Simmons	

Mr. HARRISON. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is absent on account of illness.

I have also been requested to announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] are detained on official business of the Senate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Wolcott] is detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, yesterday evening, just before I expressed a willingness for the Senate to take a recess or an adjournment, I had expressed some degree of astonishment at the position which had been assumed by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. He had taken the position that, considering the fact that the manufacturing classes had in the past robbed the agricultural classes through the instrumentality of the tariff, which was absolutely true, it now became necessary for the agricultural classes to rob the manufacturing classes back again so as to get even.

Neither within a State, amongst its industrial classes, nor outside of a State, amongst the nations of the world, can any real good or permanent good be obtained for civilization or populations by a policy of retaliation. Nothing is more clearly demonstrated in the economical world, in the moral world, and in the social world than that fact.

You can not get even with another man by retaliation. Either he can whip you or you can whip him, but there is no such thing as preserving equality and justice between you in that way. If it be wrong for him to rob you, it is equally wrong for you to rob him, and two robberies can never make an indemnity, just as two wrongs can never make one right.

Mr. President, I rose partially for the purpose of saying that, but partially for this purpose: I am a little afraid that my position in the Senate has been a bit misunderstood. I am not filibustering against the pending bill; I do not care when the bill comes to a vote, provided it comes to a vote by the orderly procedure of the business of the Senate; but when Senators call upon me to agree to a request for unanimous consent, that is a different proposition. I am perfectly willing for the Senate to attend to its business without any filibuster. I think that the right of filibustering, if it be a right, is a possession so valuable for a minority that it ought never to be wasted. It ought never to be used except for great funda-

mental and vital purposes. I would use it to preserve the principles of the Constitution; I would use it for the preservation of white supremacy upon the Pacific coast or down South; I would use it for any great fundamental, vital purpose, and try to prevent anybody interfering with it; but to use it for a mere fiscal matter has never met with my approval.

Mr. President, I wish it distinctly understood that while I will not give my consent to fixing a date for a vote upon any measure where I know what the result of the vote will be, and know that that result will be adverse to my own convictions, while I will not agree to a result, speaking individually, as an individual Member of the Senate, or to a request for unanimous consent involving adverse result, I still shall not oppose the Senate's exercising its power of organization and of decision. It reminds me a little of an incident which happened some time back—I do not remember how far it was—when, I think, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] arose and asked unanimous consent for the consideration of a resolution of international sympathy which seemed to me to disturb and violate our international duty. I said, "I hope the Senator will withdraw that request and will move what he wants, because I wish to be left free to vote against it, and I do not want to be bound by a unanimous-consent agreement." This he kindly did.

Mr. President, this august body—and I call it by that adjectival description because it generally speaks of itself in that way—has reached a pretty pass if it can not attend to legislation without unanimous consent. I think it can; I shall not interfere with its doing so; but no man can get my consent to a vote which involves a result when I know the result will be one that I do not want. That is a different proposition.

Mr. President, it was a uniform habit of the old Hamiltonian Federalists and is a habit of their successors, the Republican Party, to take advantage of any great emergency that happens to the country to begin at once, during or after the emergency, to "tinker with the tariff" and to make out of it an excuse or a pretext to raise the tariff. We had hardly laid the ghost of the War of 1812 before they attempted it then, and succeeded, leading finally to the enormous tariff of 1816, and that finally to the tariff of the thirties, known as the bill of abominations, and finally leading to threatened nullification upon the part of South Carolina. We had not got planted upon our feet during the war between the sections before somebody said, "This is a magnificent opportunity to help the special interests by increasing the tariff rates," and so the Republicans proceeded to increase them. We had not finished the Spanish-American War, we had barely begun it, when the Republican Party, true to form, moved to increase the tariff. Whenever they have won a victory of a political character, no matter upon what issue they have won it, their first skirmish-line feat has been to increase the tariff rates.

They won a victory for monometallism and against the parity of the coinage of gold and silver, and instead of proceeding at once to pass a monometallic law, they proceeded at once to increase the tariff. They won a victory upon Philippine annexation, and instead of proceeding at once to declare the congressional status of the Philippines, they proceeded to introduce a bill to raise the tariff rates. They have just won a victory against the League of Nations, they say—I will not stop to argue what it was won about, although I know 54 other reasons why it was won which I could state if I had the time—and now the first thing is not to proceed to do something about that, but to raise the tariff rates. Senators, you are running true to form, but this time you are riding to a fall.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] is making the mistake that the old English landlords made. You can pass tariff bills to increase the price of products so long as those products are not fundamental necessities of human life, but whenever you undertake to increase the price of necessities, sooner or later you are going to have either revolution upon the part of the proletariat or you are going to have political defeat. You can not tax the bread and butter and meat of the people, their daily nutriment, without having trouble.

In the past you had an innocuous duty upon wheat and several forms of cereals because the United States was the producer of the surplus of the world, which went to the markets of the world, and was an exporter of all of those products, and the duty had very little, if any, effect upon the price of the product in the American market. Now, however, the conditions have changed; over 50 per cent of the American people are living in towns. There are, in fact, more than that living in towns, Mr. President, because the census counts as towns only those places over 8,000 people, or, perhaps, the number may be 5,000, and under that figure are numberless towns the residents of which are not agriculturists, and yet they are counted as a part of

the less than fifty-odd per cent living in the towns as a part of the agricultural population.

The Senator is riding to a fall; he is riding exactly to the same fall, and he is repeating the very arguments that were used by the landlord interests of Great Britain in supporting the corn laws, until things had reached such a point, under a semirevolution, which was known then as "Chartism," accompanied by hayrick burning, general disorder, and demoralization upon the part of the laboring men in the great factory towns and the little factory villages, that even Sir Robert Peel, arch conservative that he was, was forced to repeal the corn laws. If the Senator thinks that he can establish as a permanent institution in America a system of corn laws, he is doomed to go through the same experience that the conservatives under the reluctant leadership of Sir Robert Peel went through with.

So, when the Senator undertakes to indemnify farmers for the manufacturers' robbery of the agriculturists, which has been going on for a century, by a new-found legislative tax-law robbery by the agriculturists of the manufacturing laboring class, then he is galloping to meet disappointment sooner or later. And he ought to meet with it.

I am perhaps the only man in this body whose post-office address is out in the country. I live there; every dollar I have in the world is identified with agriculture except a few dollars which I put in to help the Government out during the war, and invested in its bonds. They strained me like the mischief, and then the Government, in a very dishonest way, after giving its note to me and various other people, proceeded to tax back a part of the note so as to run the market value of its own paper down below par, which an honest man would not have done; but an allegedly honest Government has done it.

Mr. President, there is no getting away from the facts. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] on yesterday, with Scotch persistence, drove the argument home. What is your object? What is your purpose? It is to increase the price of bread and meat to the people.

If you can not do that, you can not raise their prices to the producer, which is your avowed object. If you do raise the prices to the producer, you have increased them to the people. Why not quit this nonsense, and, instead of getting even with the manufacturer by perpetrating upon him a reciprocal robbery, deprive him of the robbery that he is now perpetrating upon you. If you will decrease the price of my agricultural implements and everything which I must buy in order to carry on farming processes in the State of Mississippi, I shall demand no favors at the hands of the United States Government. I can meet all comers in the cotton field, with white men upon the quarter-deck and Negro laborers in the field, although paying them four times what is paid to the fellaheen of Egypt and six times what is paid to the peasants of India, and beat Egypt and India at their own game; but, in order that I may do so, I ask simply to be left unhampered and untaxed, except in so far as the Government shall levy a tax for revenue purposes alone for the payment of governmental necessities. That is all I ask, and if I ask more I ask something that I have no right to ask.

If you could demonstrate to me to-day that a tax upon long-staple cotton would put from \$5 to \$10 a bale in my pocket out of my next year's crop, and then ask me to support the duty upon that ground, my response would be in the words of Scripture: "Is thy servant a dog that he should do this thing?" After I have preached for a lifetime that a tariff levied for the purpose of enriching some class or some person at the expense of the general public is robbery, shall I myself become a robber, and can I reconcile it to my conscience by counting up at the end of the year the number of net dollars of profit which I have made out of the legal process? I might do that, but at the same time that I did it I would have to cease to be a gentleman, and a man wants to continue to be a gentleman to the extent that he can, no matter what his private sins are. He need not add public sin of unfair law for his own benefit to the burden which the rest of us carry.

Mr. President, I have not taken the floor for the purpose of making a long talk. I want to call attention to one more thing, and then, to prove my good faith, I am going to sit down.

What is the present condition of the world internationally, in the commercial relations of one country with another? It is a state of utterly demoralized exchange rates. And what is the matter with the exchange? What gives the dollar a premium? What puts the pound sterling and the franc and the reichsmark at a discount? It is the fact that the people in distressed Europe, to a certain extent even in England, but everywhere upon the Continent, have neither money nor credit wherewith to buy. It is the fact that they must go to work tightening their

belts as best they can to fit their provisions, and must work longer hours and more efficiently than they have ever worked before, and must save with a degree of thrift that they have not lately experienced. What is the trouble? The trouble is that they can not buy things from us. The trouble is, too, that they have not the money nor the credit to make the things to sell to us, nor to buy from us the raw material out of which to make them. They are trying the very best they can; and then comes in a great Republican professor of economical medical science, you might call it, and he says that the way to increase the production of these people so that they may increase their exports, and thereby pay to America in commodities for things that they can not pay for in dollars or francs or pounds sterling, is to do what? To cut off their exports to us! To hamper them with our laws already overhampered by lack of money and credit, as they are!

You say to the fellow in the first place: "You can not buy my goods because I can not credit you and because you have not the money to pay for them. Our Government can not afford to credit you. Our people will not credit you unless you can furnish proper security, and you can not do that. Pay us in commodities. We want your commodities." And then up steps this great Republican economical expert, who has displayed his ignorance of economical science for a hundred years in America, and says: "The right way to increase the exports of other countries to America is to tax our imports, and thereby discourage their exports." That is all of it in a nutshell. There is not any way around that statement of it.

You would think that a man who did that was a lunatic; but he is not. There is system in his madness. He is going to make a profit out of it. It may be bad for the country, but it is good for him, and that is what he is thinking about. In fact, I suppose most of them would not be willing to confess that that is what they are doing. They would camouflage around and skirmish about and make flank attacks and little demonstrations in the rear to conceal their frontal attack, and deny positively that they were making any frontal attack at all.

Mr. President, how are you going to reestablish "normalcy"? We have great Republican authority for that un-English word here lately. I never heard of it before. I suppose what was meant was the normal peace condition of things; but "normalcy" is the new word. It has been added to the dictionary, I suppose, as a part of the *logos* of the Republican Party. How are you going to reestablish so-called "normalcy" of international exchange, which is absolutely necessary to stabilize international trade, when faced with a situation where the other man can not pay you except in products, by putting a tax upon his products to the small extent that he now can ship them and to the large extent that it is hoped that he may hereafter be able to ship them?

Mr. President, the idea of a man raising himself by his boot straps over a fence is not any new one. A great many people have been trying to do that ever since the world began. So far, nobody has succeeded. Sometimes, if a man keeps at it long enough, somebody else will put a bomb under him in the shape of a revolution, and then he will go over the fence; but he will go over the fence dead and not alive. Now, I warn the farmers of this country against this short-sighted course—and when I warn them I am warning myself. I warn you that whenever total or partial prohibition of imports of bread and meat becomes a farmers' instrument for robbery, the proletariat will rise just like they did in Great Britain.

Whenever a tariff not only produces higher prices, as it does when levied upon manufactured products, but when it begins to mean stress and strain for the human being to clothe and feed himself, when it comes to be measured not alone in dollars and cents but in human suffering, then humanity is going to revolt, whether you like it or not. You and I are living away out in the country, where we can not get together. We can not form militia companies. We can not gather together at the tocsin of a bell. We would be as helpless as the Russian peasant is to-day. The one class that can not carry on an organized fight is the agriculturist; but he can carry on a fight and a fight to a successful issue, always provided he plant his feet upon the rock of human justice, claim nothing for himself that is not plain justice, and deny to everybody else everything that is injustice. There he does not need organization, because behind him and with him will stand God and the common sense and the common conscience of the middle classes. When he goes to the extreme of taxing the bellies of the people, taxing the appetites and the food necessities of the people, he will not have either the common sense or the common conscience of the middle classes or of the common people anywhere with him.

Mr. President, you can not carry forward civilization, you can not increase the sum total of humanity, you can not produce a

state of mind—and nearly everything is psychologic—which leads men rather to love one another than to hate one another by inaugurating a policy of retaliation. You can not do it amongst industrial classes within a State. You can not do it as between different States on the earth, which has become a little bit of a thing, so small that maybe a man could go around it in 12 or 15 days in an airplane. Mutual service, mutual helpfulness, mutual sacrifice may be called idealism, they may be said to be vain altruism, but they are the only really practical things in the world. Mutual retaliation can not help one class within a country fighting another through the instrumentality of a law fixing tariff rates, one country fighting another upon the high seas in great international trade through the instrumentality of conflicting and rivaling tax rates, one country fighting another through threat of immense armament on land or on sea, one country fighting another by pretense to superiority of culture or of organization or something else.

It is stupid enough for nations to make war on one another through tariff instead of leaving things where God intended that they should be left, so that the man who could produce a given product of the best quality at the cheapest price could sell it to another man who could not produce it at the best quality at the cheapest price, and he in his turn might produce something else of the best quality at the cheapest price and sell it to man No. 1. You are just interfering with the laws of nature and of nature's God; and while you can not, owing to the almost bankrupt condition of the world, have now or within my lifetime or the lifetime of my grandchildren, probably, anything approximating free commercial relations, so-called free trade, you can refrain from making the restrictions so high as to be a token of animosity rather than a token of friendship to other nations when your whole Nation acts. You can also refrain from like folly as between classes within your own Nation by refusing to attempt to enact either an industrial class tariff or a sectional tariff.

Mr. President, I am not filibustering against this bill. The bill can come to a vote any minute the Senate pleases. I do not care, except that nobody must ask my consent to it. That is a different proposition. I shall not consent to something that I do not believe in. I shall not consent to a vote when I know the result; and I would be a fool if I did not know that I was consenting to an undesired result. I shall not be bound by any number of private agreements made by anybody to that effect; but this bill can be carried to a vote long before the 16th of February, which is the date requested, by the orderly processes of the business of the Senate, without making me particeps criminis in it by requiring my consent.

Mr. McCUMBER. No Senator presents as logical an argument in favor of free trade as the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], and it is the same argument he has made year after year. I do not desire to take up that argument at this time; but, Mr. President, the amendment agreed to a short time ago was agreed to when only a few Senators were present and when the attention of some Members on the other side was diverted from the bill. As we want to have every amendment carried fairly and fully, I ask unanimous consent for a reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment to the wheat item was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There were two or three amendments agreed to.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am making the request only in respect to the first amendment. The other I do not think will be objected to. It is merely an exception to the rule, and nothing else.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote whereby the amendment was agreed to is reconsidered.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understood the Senator's motion to be to reconsider all the amendments agreed to.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I asked only as to the first item. I think the question on the amendment as to meats was not put by the Chair, although the amendment was read. The second amendment is with reference to rice, and it provides that the bill shall not apply to a certain class of rice, in which, I understand, there is no competition, and which is used only for soups or something of that character. If the Senator wants to have a reconsideration of that amendment, I have no objection.

Mr. SIMMONS. No; I think it is sufficient to have a reconsideration of the amendment with reference to wheat. I want to say, Mr. President, that when the amendment was agreed to there were only two or three Senators on this side of the Chamber, and those who were present advise me that they thought a bill relating to Indian lands in some way or other was before the Senate, and they were utterly unaware of the

fact that a viva voce vote was being taken on the item of wheat.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOWNSEND in the chair). The question is in agreeing to the first amendment of the committee.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, as we want a full vote upon this amendment, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Harris	McKellar	Spencer
Borah	Harrison	McLean	Sterling
Brandegee	Heflin	Nelson	Sutherland
Capper	Henderson	New	Townsend
Culberson	Johnson, Calif.	Overman	Trammell
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Owen	Underwood
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Page	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Kellogg	Philpps	Walsh, Mont.
Elkins	King	Polindexter	Warren
France	Kirby	Sheppard	Williams
Gay	Lenroot	Shields	Willis
Glass	McCormick	Simmons	Wolcott
Goddard	McCumber	Smoot	

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the absence of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] on official business.

I also desire to announce the absence of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL], who are detained at a meeting of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum is present. The question is on the first amendment reported by the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understand the Chair to have announced that a quorum is present?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did so announce.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I do not object, but would like to have the yeas and nays. However, I want to say just one word with reference to the pending amendment proposing to raise the House rate of 30 cents to 40 cents a bushel on wheat. There was a duty of 30 cents a bushel on wheat when it was bringing about a dollar a bushel. That was 30 per cent ad valorem. Under the present prices, with everything almost double, a duty of 40 cents per bushel would be 22 per cent ad valorem. But with 40 cents per bushel specific duty, after deducting the advantage of the difference in exchange of 27 cents a bushel, it will leave us only 13 cents a bushel protection.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat I would like to ask him a question. The tariff on wheat in the Underwood Act was 10 cents a bushel, with the exception that it was changed in those countries which admitted our products free. This is an increase of practically 30 cents in most countries; in some countries it is an increase of 40 cents a bushel.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think the Senator is in error. I think the last tariff act was to this effect, that if we had free trade between the countries on the particular article there would be no duty. If Canada did not give us free trade on both flour and wheat, then there should be 10 cents a bushel duty.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I have been diligently endeavoring to comprehend the importance or the significance of the difference in the exchange as it affects the rates prescribed in this bill. I must confess that I, perhaps, do not appreciate it at all. I am unable to understand why the difference in the rates of exchange should affect the tariff rate in any way as long as it is figured in United States money; nor do I understand how it operates to make importations easier.

Speaking specifically with respect to wheat, which may be used for the purpose of illustration well enough, obviously in any country in which the currency is depreciated in value, more of their money must be paid for commodities. I saw a statement in a paper the other day about some American traveling man who submitted an expense account for expenses incurred by him in the course of a trip to southern Russia. He had to pay some thousands of rubles for a night's lodging, something like a million rubles for a short ride on a railroad train, and similar amounts for other accommodations of that character. As a matter of course, English currency is depreciated, in terms of our money, all over the world, and if you are going to buy you must, of course, pay more in English currency than you pay in

American currency. So, if you go to Canada to buy wheat, you must pay more per bushel in Canadian money than you pay in the United States for the same quantity of wheat, or than you pay in Canada with United States money.

In a report which I have before me, submitted by the Tariff Commission, it is shown that the quotations for wheat in Canada are higher than they are in the United States. That is, if you go to Canada you pay a dollar and a half a bushel for wheat, but you pay it in Canadian money, which is the equivalent of perhaps a dollar and a quarter or a dollar and twenty cents in our money.

I can not understand why under those circumstances any additional rate should be charged because of the difference in the exchange rate. Moreover, it is said that we must impose a high tariff upon these commodities by reason of the fact that they come into our country readily, and importations are invited by reason of the rate of exchange. That is something I do not comprehend either. A large portion of the tariff, as I understand from the remarks made by the Senator from North Dakota a number of times upon wheat, is imposed for the purpose of equalizing the situation as it is affected by the rate of exchange.

I have a table compiled by the Tariff Commission showing the prices of wheat in Winnipeg at various times, stated as a matter of course in terms of Canadian money. Almost invariably those prices are higher than they are in the United States, but when they are reduced to terms of United States money the Winnipeg prices are substantially the same as the Minneapolis prices. Under those circumstances why should we take into consideration the difference in the exchange rate? A man takes a certain amount of American money into Canada and buys wheat with it there at the current higher price in Minneapolis. He takes that wheat to Minneapolis and sells it in the American market, but he gets American money for it, and he gets substantially the same price for it that he gets in Winnipeg if he makes that transfer.

I have listened rather disconnectedly to the discussion of that feature of the tariff by the Senator from North Dakota, and so far as I am at present advised I freely confess I do not comprehend it at all. I should be glad to be enlightened, if I can, by anyone who has anything to say on that feature of the schedule.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I think Senators get a little confused sometimes in using as illustrations Winnipeg and Minneapolis. If we want to get a more accurate relation between any two points, we should take Winnipeg and Duluth, remembering always that Winnipeg exports at Fort William or Port Arthur on the opposite side of the lake. Of course, if we can buy Canadian wheat for a certain price and that price is in Canadian dollars, and then we can buy it with American dollars for 10 or 15 or 20 or 30 cents cheaper when reduced to the American dollar as compared with the Canadian dollar, I do not for a moment contend that we can take that wheat into exactly the same market and sell it ordinarily for an advanced price, because the moment that we bring it to our market for that depreciated price, when reduced to American currency, our product has to go down to the same level.

The Minnesota wheat has to get a rate on a level with the price that is paid for the Canadian wheat after making the allowance, and therefore the markets would be exactly the same, or should be, other things being equal, at the same point. If we could get wheat from Canada cheaper than we could get it from the United States without the exchange, the Senator can see that the moment it is brought over, with a reduction on account of exchange, our market must fall to meet the price paid for the Canadian grain; and that is exactly what happened.

Now, if we would keep out that Canadian grain by a tariff that would equal even the exchange, we would be ahead the amount of the exchange. If we would put on a protection greater than that, we would have a tariff in addition to the exchange; but of course in the same market where there is absolute free trade the exchange bringing down the price of the foreign product even with the American dollar will necessarily drive our product down to the same level, because both will sell in the same market at identically the same price.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That seems to be altogether clear; I can understand that perfectly; namely, that if wheat were selling in Duluth and in Winnipeg or Fort William at exactly the same figure, and it was bought at that figure in Canada and taken into this country and brought into competition with our wheat, our wheat would be suffering because it would be brought down, as the Senator says, to the level of the price of the Canadian wheat in terms of American money. But the trouble about that is that prices in the Canadian market are higher,

measured in terms of American money, than they are in the American market, and that when the price as quoted in the Canadian market is reduced to terms of American money the prices are exactly identical, and so the Tariff Commission reports. I read from page 10—

Mr. McCUMBER. They report a comparison between Minneapolis and Winnipeg.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly. I suppose the Tariff Commission—

Mr. McCUMBER. They do not compare the prices, I will call the Senator's attention, between Winnipeg and Chicago, they do not compare the prices between Winnipeg and Duluth because the Winnipeg prices and the Duluth and Chicago prices place the products on the Great Lakes in every instance, and the export costs would be practically the same.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I assume that the experts whom we have employed for the express purpose have instituted comparisons that may be of some help to us. They have evidently taken, for the purpose of illustrating a proposition, the prices in Minneapolis and Winnipeg, and they say that because of that the exchange rate is a matter of no consequence whatever. I read from page 10 of their report as follows:

It is often assumed that American purchasers get the full advantage of the exchange rates when the American dollar is at a premium. This by no means follows, however, in every case. From Table 5, appended below, it is seen that the Winnipeg price of wheat converted into American money is almost the same as that for similar wheat in Minneapolis.

Mr. McCUMBER. Of course, because it brings Minneapolis wheat down to the Canadian price.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly; so that the two prices are the same. Therefore, in adjusting tariff rates why should you take into consideration the exchange rate at all? So with respect to all these commodities, the argument is made that we ought to have a high protective tariff upon practically every import now because the exchange rates are so favorable to this country and so much against the foreign countries.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a moment—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to make this suggestion: I remember that for many years before the Ways and Means Committee of the House there was a continuous demand, by interests that desired protection, that a tariff should be written to protect against adverse freight rates, that the freight rate was against them coming to the seashore, and therefore they wanted a tariff to protect against that, overlooking the fact that the freight rate changed at each mile, and that we would have to have a tariff to change with each mile of advance. It seems to me the same thing applies to the exchange proposition. The question of exchange between different countries changes from day to day, if not every hour, and if we attempt to meet that condition by a tariff which must be fixed, we would no longer get it fixed than we would have to have it adjusted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We would have to have a movable tariff.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, as the Senator from Mississippi suggests, we would have to have a movable tariff.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have no doubt in the world the price will change as the exchange rate changes; in other words, if the exchange should approximate its ordinary normal level as between this country and Canada, we would find quotations on the Winnipeg market for wheat substantially the same as prices in the Minneapolis market.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. The same principle for which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] is now contending seems to have been carried all through the measure. If a product comes from South America—and some of our chief imports are from South America—in fixing the rate on that import or imports of that character, as I understand it, they take into consideration the difference in exchange between the currency of this country and South America. If our imports came chiefly from Germany, say, to this country, they would take into consideration in the bill the difference in exchange between the currency of this country and Germany. They have tried to follow that principle all through the bill; in the high rates which they have fixed they have made allowance for what they have assumed to be the difference in the rate of exchange as reflected in the prices in the two countries.

In that situation, if there should be a world adjustment within a brief period of time, bringing about a stabilization of exchange, or if for any reason whatsoever in the next 2 months or within the next 10 months there should be a wiping out, in any of the countries from which the imports come or in

all of them, of the difference at present obtaining in the rate of exchange, is it not then apparent that for the balance of the 10 months' period when the bill is in operation the producers in this country would get the benefit of the rate fixed upon a basis that has absolutely disappeared and is inoperative?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Undoubtedly. That is simply an indication of the difficulty of fixing any just tariff rate at this time.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator from North Dakota makes some question about the fact, as the Senator from Montana contends and as I contend, that there is very nearly a parity in the price of wheat in this country and in Canada, eliminating altogether the question of the difference in exchange. I brought out the very figures which the Senator has brought out upon the very threshold of the controversy on the question of wheat, and pressed them upon the Senator from North Dakota. If they did not speak the truth, if they did not represent the facts as to the price of the product in the two countries, the Senator from North Dakota, because it is fundamental in his argument, would have brought other figures here to show that the statements made by the Tariff Commission are not correct.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I precipitated the discussion at this time not because I am especially interested in the application of the principle to the importation of wheat, but I understand, as is now suggested by the Senator from North Carolina, that the same principle is carried clear through the bill, and that every one of the rates is made higher than it would be made under ordinary circumstances by reason of the difference in the rate of exchange. I thought that if I had a correct opinion about the matter the error could be very conveniently exposed by consideration of the rate upon wheat in the light of the information we have upon that particular subject from the Tariff Commission, to which I shall invite the attention of the Senate.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Montana to another situation as a possible and practical illustration of the point which he is making. For instance, the difference in the exchange between Germany and the United States, based on German money, is about 1,800 per cent. If the difference in exchange should operate to its fullest extent, then would not the bushel of wheat in Germany have a bounty put upon it for export to the United States to the amount of 1,800 per cent? In reading the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee of the other House which occurred a few days ago I found it was claimed that the difference in exchange to the full amount of the difference operated as a bounty in favor of the country having the lower parity, and in the case of Germany it is about 1,800 per cent. I think the German mark is worth now about one-eighteenth of its parity in gold. Does not that show the absurdity of the proposition that the difference in exchange operates in the way that is claimed for it in regard to importations?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I think that is quite right; but further than that, as a matter of course, if the tariff rate is adjusted with reference to the rate of exchange between this country and Great Britain, any country with respect to which the rate of exchange is less favorable than it is to Great Britain would have a very decided advantage over Great Britain in the importation of goods into this country. The schedules would thus be discriminatory against the country having the more stable and desirable currency and in favor of those countries whose currency is most depreciated. However, Mr. President, let me proceed. I read further from the report to which I called the attention of the Senate, as follows:

This identity of prices in the two markets is of importance in connection with the exchange situation. It is obvious that the American purchaser of Canadian wheat can not get it any cheaper than he can buy the same grades of the domestic product. In other words, there is no special inducement for buying Canadian wheat offered by the exchange situation. It does not appear that the individual seller has a greater incentive to sell in Minneapolis than in Winnipeg, because, as a matter of fact, the prices are about the same in the two markets.

Mr. President, if that is the case, let us follow it clear down the list. Take wool, for instance. It is argued that there should be a very heavy duty upon wool by reason of the unfavorable exchange rate, but it is reasonable to suppose that in any country where the rate of exchange is unfavorable as compared with that of the United States one would be obliged to pay more in the money of that country for a given amount of wool. So with reference to long-staple cotton, if the exchange rate between this country and Egypt is unfavorable to that country, obviously one will be obliged to pay more in Egyptian money for a certain quantity of long-staple cotton than he

would be obliged to pay in American money. Accordingly, it seems to me that so far as the feature of difference in exchange is concerned the rates in this bill have been framed upon an entirely erroneous basis.

But let me illustrate the situation from Table 5 in the report, to which reference is made in the portion of the report from which I quoted. The table is headed:

Cash prices per bushel of wheat at Winnipeg and Minneapolis.

In Winnipeg on October 23, 1920, the price of Minneapolis No. 1 northern spring wheat was \$2.07. There is no comparison there with the Canadian price given on that date. On October 25, 1920, in Minneapolis, the price of No. 1 northern spring wheat was \$2.05; in Winnipeg, Manitoba, the price of No. 1, par of exchange, was \$2.27; but reduced to American money it was \$2.05. In other words, a certain quality of wheat was sold on the Minneapolis market on October 25 at \$2.05; the same quality of wheat was selling in the Winnipeg market at \$2.27, but \$2.27, measured in Canadian money current in Winnipeg, reduced to American money, was exactly \$2.05, the prices being identical. On October 26, in Minneapolis, the price was \$2.12; in Winnipeg, it was \$2.35; reduced to American money, it was \$2.12. On October 28, in Minneapolis, the price was \$2.11; in Winnipeg, it was quoted at \$2.32; and considering the rate of exchange, it was \$2.10. Let us get down to more recent dates. On November 16 the Minneapolis price was \$1.82, the Winnipeg price was \$2.11; and, taking into consideration the difference in exchange, \$1.88 was the price in Winnipeg. So, considering the current rate of exchange, the actual price in Winnipeg was higher than in Minneapolis. On November 17 the Minneapolis price was \$1.77; the Winnipeg price, \$2.11, or, considering the difference in exchange, \$1.88.

On November 20 the Minneapolis price was \$1.58; the Winnipeg price \$1.98, or, considering exchange, \$1.77.

Let us take the quotations down to December 14. On that date the Minneapolis price was \$1.66; the Manitoba price \$1.89, or, with exchange calculated, \$1.63.

On December 17 the Minneapolis price was \$1.65; the Winnipeg price \$1.94, or, considering exchange, \$1.65. On December 18 the Minneapolis price was \$1.66; the Winnipeg price \$1.91, or, taking into consideration the difference of exchange, \$1.62. So that the prices, with the exchange figured, were practically the same in the two cities.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I must confess that I can not vote for any of the rates proposed by the bill to be levied on wheat, should I be disposed to vote for the bill as a whole—with respect to which I have not definitely made up my mind—until I may be further enlightened in some way or another as to the necessity of taking into consideration the difference in the rate of exchange as a basis for the rates proposed.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I do not intend to go into the matter of the rate of exchange, nor shall I especially contend with the free-trade Tariff Commission, although I think they have been most unfair in the way they have attempted to establish their proposition.

I have listened to the quotation which the Senator has just read, and which has been put into the Record several times. Those who assert that we will get no benefit from any kind of a protection on grain base their assumption upon the claim that the Liverpool market fixes the price. I will accept their argument just for a moment and see where it leads them. Here is some American grain in Duluth, and here is some grain of exactly the same character at Fort William and quoted on the Winnipeg market. Both can be shipped to Liverpool for exactly the same cost of transportation, and both, they say, are governed by the Liverpool price; and therefore it is said that the price of the Duluth wheat for export purposes and of the Winnipeg or Fort William price—and Fort William means the same as Fort Winnipeg—are exactly the same. Can not Senators see, therefore, that where the product is exactly of the same inherent value and ultimately must be sold, that if there is a rate of exchange in our favor as against Canada and Canadian money, we will buy that wheat for the Canadian price and then discount it according to the difference in exchange, and thus, if we could keep our price up on this side, we could make an immense amount of money by buying the Canadian wheat and selling it in the American market? Can not they also see that the very first shipment of Canadian wheat that was offered would immediately drive our price down to the same level as the Canadian price? That is exactly what happens, because the two prices after making the exchange allowance are practically the same. But it is the same because the American price has been forced down by this unfair competition to the Canadian price. It is said, therefore, there will be nothing made by bringing Canadian wheat into this country. Then, why in

heaven's name is it brought into this country to the extent of 65,000,000 bushels as against one or two million bushels in any other year?

Let me give a case that is a little more concrete, so as to bring this matter right home. I notice the Tariff Commission did not make the comparison between the Canadian and Chicago market. We raise No. 1 hard to some extent in the Northwest section, and the same quality of wheat is raised in Canada, and a considerable quantity, though not nearly so much as is consumed in the Minneapolis mills and along the Lakes, goes to Chicago.

Up to, I think, October 14—I gave the date the other day—Chicago had not felt the result of the Canadian importations. On the date named the price of Canadian No. 1 hard in Winnipeg or Fort William was \$1.85 and of American No. 1 hard in Chicago \$1.84, only one penny difference. The price of Canadian No. 1 hard was \$1.85 in Canadian money, while the price of American No. 1 hard was \$1.84 in American money. Immediately the grain began to flow toward Chicago necessarily it must drive the Chicago price very quickly down to the Canadian price, and that is practically what has happened. The Chicago market is not quite as competitive for that character of wheat as is the Minneapolis market, because the No. 1 hard that goes to Chicago is mixed with another kind of wheat to make a certain grade of flour, but on the whole Senators can see that our price must necessarily come down to Canadian prices, less the exchange, and they must equalize each other. This is exactly what has happened. If the price in Chicago or Minneapolis had remained at \$1.84 and the price at Winnipeg or Fort William had continued to be \$1.85, the importer would have made about 27 cents a bushel on the difference of exchange. But I do not care about going into the subject any further. I think it has been discussed over and over again, and I should like a vote.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOWNSEND in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. The House bill carries a rate of 30 cents per bushel. Does the Senator believe that if that should be enacted into law, the price of wheat will increase 30 cents per bushel?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not think it will increase the full 30 cents a bushel. It would depend a great deal. We are shipping abroad. We are getting rid of our surplus. Of course, we are not getting rid of it very rapidly, because it is coming in as rapidly as we are shipping it out of the United States, so that we are keeping our surplus just about the same; but if we can stop that flow we will soon be rid of our surplus; and if we get rid of the entire surplus it will come up to the 30 cents a bushel; but if we do not do that we will still get some protection, and I think we might get a protection of 15 or 20 cents a bushel. I think, with 40 cents it will give us a good protection in a very short time.

Mr. LENROOT. One other question: In view of the surplus that we have to export, does not the Senator think that, so far as real protection to the farmer is concerned, 30 cents per bushel will give him the same protection as 40 cents?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not. I do not, because of the difference in the exchange, which amounts to 27 cents a bushel, and would leave only 3 cents as the real protection.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator spoke of the price of wheat in Winnipeg being \$1.84 and at the same time in Chicago \$1.85.

Mr. McCUMBER. That was back in October.

Mr. LENROOT. Of course, the Senator understands that the price of wheat of the same grade usually is lower in Winnipeg than in Chicago, by reason of the transportation rate.

Mr. McCUMBER. No.

Mr. LENROOT. Of the same grade?

Mr. McCUMBER. No. It will depend a great deal. It is generally a little lower, but that is not by reason of the transportation rates, because Winnipeg exports through Fort William, of course, and Chicago is on the lake, and so there would be practically no transportation rates between the two.

Mr. LENROOT. That is only upon the theory that Liverpool makes the rate; but upon the theory that the rate is made in this country, a rate made in Chicago for domestic consumption would naturally be higher than a rate made at Fort William.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; but if you are on the lake, and the grain may go either into export or into consumption, if a portion of it is at Duluth on one side of the lake, and if another portion of it is at Fort William on the other side of the lake,

they can both be transported to any inland part of the United States for practically the same price.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota, if he will permit me, if it is not a fact that Canada is exporting to other nations than the United States large quantities of wheat and flour?

Mr. McCUMBER. She will be exporting. For a while she exported almost none except to the United States; but I hope now that while the Lakes are closed she will be compelled to throw more of it into transportation to other countries.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, my information is that Canada has been exporting wheat to other nations, as well as flour.

Mr. McCUMBER. She always does. She has about 220,000,000 bushels to export. She has exported to the United States from 65,000,000 to 75,000,000 bushels. Of course, there is considerable left to export somewhere else.

Mr. KING. And, Mr. President, we are also exporting to foreign nations; so that the price of wheat is determined largely—and I am not quite sure as to the amount of potency the foreign market has in fixing the price—by the purchases in other nations. Now, it seems to me unquestionable that with Canada exporting to foreign nations and the United States exporting to foreign nations, that would determine the price both for Canadian wheat and for American wheat, and would bring the wheat of both nations to approximately the same level.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have tried to explain, I think, a few hundred times, and I do not get Senators to understand it yet, that we do not export one bushel of that wheat that comes into competition with the wheat of Canada. It is all consumed in the United States. We are short of that particular kind of grain, known as the hard spring wheat, and we do not export it. We do not export a bushel of it. It is all made into flour in the United States. If you cut off Canada from exporting to this country the same kind of wheat, we have a deficit of the wheat that is raised in that section, and the price of that wheat is bound to come up if you cut off the inflow, and it is bound to reflect itself in the price of every other bushel of wheat in the United States.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, without conceding what the Senator has just stated to be entirely accurate, I have not any doubt, from the statistics and from the figures and from the data which are available to all, that the price even of the wheat to which the Senator refers is determined largely, if not wholly, by export prices.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I do not intend to discuss this bill, but I want to make just a few observations as to why I am supporting the bill and why I am going to support the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER].

I do not believe that the difference in exchange between this country and foreign countries reflects itself wholly in the difference of prices. I can not conceive that where the difference in exchange as between this country and Germany is as much as 1,800 per cent it would be reflected in the prices of commodities. I think that the money value of those countries, as measured by commodities in those countries, should be taken as the basis; but there is no evidence before the committee or before the Senate as to what that difference is in the various countries of the world.

I do not believe that this measure should be considered as one balancing the difference of conditions as between this country and other countries. I have rather looked upon this measure as a practical embargo upon the commodities mentioned in the bill coming into this country from other countries. In this great emergency I have been willing that an embargo should be placed upon any of these commodities, so that this country could have an opportunity to readjust its affairs.

I do not believe that this bill furnishes a complete or a proper remedy. I think that something quite different should be entered upon to relieve the situation as it exists here; but I have been willing, and am willing, that we shall protect ourselves in the emergency until we can devise some means for bringing about a proper solution of the very troublesome situation, and it is with that view that I am going to favor this duty of 40 cents. I had just as soon put it at \$1, so far as I am concerned, because I do not believe that it rests upon any proper foundation as a tariff measure, and I think it should be considered solely as an embargo measure; and upon that theory alone do I believe that this amendment can be supported.

As has been stated by different Senators upon this floor, there is no principle running through this bill which meets the requirements of either party upon the tariff question as a permanent law. So I think this should be considered really

as an embargo measure, and as such I want to put the rate just as high as anybody is willing to put it, and I expect to support the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I do not rise for the purpose of making a speech; but there is one view of this matter that I feel that I ought to present to the Senate before the vote on the wheat duty is taken.

I discover from the report of the Tariff Commission on staple agricultural products that our importations during the year 1919 from Canada of vegetable products, which include wheat, and of animals products, amounted to the sum of \$131,220,384. Our exports of these products—that is, of vegetable products and animal products—to Canada during that year were in value \$222,194,709, or \$90,974,325 in excess of our imports. Among these imports from Canada wheat constitutes the chief product. Upon that there is at present no duty. This bill proposes to place upon each bushel of that product a duty of 40 cents.

Another of the items of large import into this country from Canada is potatoes. Canada in the year referred to exported to the United States nearly \$4,000,000 worth of potatoes. This bill proposes a great increase in the duty on potatoes.

It is from Canada that practically all of our wheat imports come. The Senator from North Dakota, in all of his discussions, has laid stress upon the argument that it is necessary to protect the American producer of wheat against the Canadian producer of wheat, and it has been assumed as true and admitted as true in all of our discussions that the purpose in imposing this 40-cent duty on wheat is to exclude the wheat of Canada, there being no contention that wheat is coming in from elsewhere, except in negligible quantities, if at all.

Likewise with reference to the duty upon potatoes. With the exception of a very small quantity of potatoes imported from Bermuda, practically all of the potatoes we are getting now from abroad come from Canada. So that the duty imposed upon potatoes is aimed at the Canadian product, and in the case of wheat as well as in the case of potatoes the duties are put so high as to be almost, if not quite, prohibitive, and amount therefore to an embargo on these two products, which constitute such large items in Canadian exports to this country.

Another item included in the list of products coming from Canada is live stock. The duty placed upon live stock in this bill is very high, very much higher than the duty in the Payne-Aldrich bill.

From what countries are we importing live stock now, and at what country is this increase in duty aimed?

Mr. President, it is well known that live stock imported to this country comes chiefly from Canada and Mexico. Canada exported to this country in 1919 live stock to the value of thirty-odd million dollars. Now, it is proposed to greatly restrict, if not exclude, Canadian live stock from our markets. Another product heretofore largely imported from Canada is dairy products. It is now proposed to put a high duty on nearly all dairy products; that is also aimed chiefly at Canada, because in normal conditions the bulk of the dairy products imported into this country from abroad come from Canada.

There are other items here. The imports of hides amounted in value to \$10,000,000. The imposition of the duty on hides is, of course, not aimed at Canada, but Canada is an exporter of hides, and we have been one of her customers.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRONNA in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. SIMMONS. ✓ yield.

Mr. STERLING. Taking live stock as an example, does not the Senator see some reasonable ground for a tariff on live stock, when farmers and stock raisers in this country are obliged to sell their live stock at less than it costs to produce it? Should we not protect ourselves against any importations from abroad to some extent?

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, if I had time to go into it—and I will go into it a little later, I assure the Senator—I think I would be able to show the Senator that imports from Canada of that particular product are not menacing, are not the cause of the low prices of which our stock raiser complains. There have been no excessive imports into this country of live stock, and the imports of live stock that have come heretofore for consumption in this country—I think I could show the Senators if I had time now to go into the matter—are not on the increase. We are not threatened with any great inundation of imports of live stock into this country. That is not the trouble from which the farmers are now suffering. The imports of stock from Canada are in considerable part of fine breeds of

stock, brought in for the purpose of improving breeds in this country.

Mr. STERLING. I do not know so clearly as to that, Mr. President, but the Senator from North Carolina takes the position that there have been no excessive imports. My position is that any imports under present conditions are excessive.

Mr. SIMMONS. Even if they are for the purpose of improving American breeds? Does the Senator contend that?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, has the Senator any figures as to imports from Canada last year?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; I stated that I did not have them.

Mr. CURTIS. According to my recollection, they amounted to \$41,965,000. The number imported from Canada was 489,690, and they were largely for beef purposes. The cattle imported for stock purposes came from Europe.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am under the impression that is a mistake. But, however that may be, Mr. President, this item in the bill is aimed at our imports of cattle from Canada and Mexico, chiefly from Canada.

The point I wish to drive home to the Senate is that in the pending bill the Members of the majority have selected the items which constitute the bulk of Canadian exports to this country of vegetable and animal products, and it is proposed to levy upon those imports duties that will amount almost to a prohibition against their coming in hereafter, and that in the face of the fact that we are selling Canada over \$100,000,000 worth of these very products more than we buy from her.

Mr. President, in this condition, if we put this embargo against imports of these vegetable products from Canada, these products which constitute in large measure the exports of Canada to this country, and which enable Canada to pay for the great excess of goods she buys from us over and above what that country sells us, do not Senators believe that the natural effect will be to greatly disturb the harmonious trade and even political relations that have heretofore very happily existed between the United States and Canada? Could Senators expect Canada to receive this blow, for it will be a severe blow to her if the bill has the effect its proponents contend it will have; do Senators believe that Canada will receive it in a kindly spirit? On the contrary, do they not believe Canada will receive it in a very resentful and hostile spirit, and would not that be natural?

Mr. GRONNA. Will the Senator permit me to make an observation with reference to his inquiry?

Mr. SIMMONS. I am speaking now with great earnestness about this, because I do really apprehend that the effect of this bill, largely aimed at Canada, so far as the duties on these products are concerned, is going to make trouble between this country and Canada and disturb the relations of the two countries, which have not only been harmonious, but which have caused Canada to become our very best customer in all the world except Great Britain.

Mr. GRONNA. I have no doubt the Senator entertains the opinion, and that he has fears, that this is going to seriously disturb the relations between Canada and this country. But if he will permit me, I believe I can show him that such is not the case. I will take an actual business transaction which has happened just recently, and I believe I can show the Senator that if we increase the duty two times the amount this bill carries it still could not prohibit the shipment of Canadian cattle, and it would allow our people to get a fair price. I received this morning a letter, which consists of only a few lines—

Mr. SIMMONS. Before the Senator reads that let me ask him a question. If Canada were to put as high a duty upon the principal products we sell to Canada as is imposed in this bill, does not the Senator believe that it would very seriously operate against our export trade with that country? Can it have a different effect on Canada's trade with this country than a similar tariff wall put up by Canada would have upon our sales to Canada?

Mr. GRONNA. But if Canada wants our products, is it not reasonable to suppose that Canada will not impose such a high duty?

Mr. SIMMONS. Canada is an agricultural country, just as ours is an agricultural country. Canada's chief exports are agricultural products. It is worse in the case of Canada than it would be with the United States, because Canada has but little to export except agricultural products to exchange in payment for her foreign purchases, while we have not only agricultural products but manufactured products.

Mr. GRONNA. There is this difference, I will say to the Senator—

Mr. SIMMONS. So this high wall of protection against Canadian goods operates more heavily against Canada than a

like high wall against our exports to Canada would operate against us.

Mr. GRONNA. There is this difference, if the Senator will permit me to say so, that Canada needs our products and must have them. The people of the United States do not need the products to which the Senator has recently been referring.

Mr. SIMMONS. Let me call attention to this: The Senator has made reference to our exports of manufactured products, but I have just shown that we exported to Canada in the year 1919, \$222,000,000 worth of agricultural products, while we imported from Canada only \$121,000,000 worth of products of this character, which clearly demonstrates that while Canada needs our agricultural products, we also need Canada's agricultural products.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator knows that the figures he gives are largely manufactured products and they are not at all what some people like to term raw material.

Mr. SIMMONS. I gave the figures for vegetable products and animal products.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I have studied those figures. I wish to call the Senator's attention to this, in order to relieve him of the fear which he entertains that we might do an injustice to Canada. I wish to take a specific case, and it is a very simple one. I received in the mail this morning two communications, one from the Western Association of Shoe Wholesalers, protesting against the bill and protesting against the provision placing a duty on hides. It is natural that the shoe manufacturers are interested in the price of hides. In the same mail I received a letter from a gentleman whom I know very well, Mr. Edward S. Lee. He inclosed an invoice for a hide, one hide only, shipped by a farmer in South Dakota to one of the terminal markets. The hide weighed 52 pounds. There was a tare of 4 pounds, leaving a net weight of 48 pounds. The price was 4 cents a pound, which amounted to \$1.92. The freight, not express, but freight, was \$1.48, leaving the farmer 44 cents for the whole hide. That transaction was on December 29, 1920. Does the Senator believe that if we double that price and make the price of hides 8 cents a pound it would be an injustice to anyone?

Mr. SIMMONS. I think the price of hides at this time is not going to be affected very much in this country by the tariff. The truth of the business is that there is a very great surplus of hides in the United States at this time. We have at this time more than a year's supply on hand, and no considerable further imports of hides are probable in the near future or during the life of this measure, because there is no market demand here for more hides. There is no market in this country for hides now, and that is the reason why hides are so low. There is no market in the country for hides, because we are stocked up, we are overloaded, and we have more than we need for a year to come. No one is going to bring any more hides into the country, whether we have a duty on hides or not, as long as this condition exists, because no one here wants to buy them.

Mr. GRONNA. It is true that trainload after trainload of cattle have been shipped from Canada into the United States markets. It is also true that during the month of January alone more than 900 carloads of wheat came through one port.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is the very point I desire to make. We are selling to Canada, we are buying from Canada, we are trading with Canada in agricultural products. We have now a mutual trade with Canada in agricultural products. We have let down the bars, and we are treating Canada as one of the States of the Union; and Canada is treating the United States as she treats her own people. We have an established and mutual trade in agricultural products as well as in other products. The result is that in agricultural products, although she is a distinctively agricultural country, the advantage is in our favor to the extent of \$100,000,000 a year. In addition to that, there is to consider the enormous exportation of our manufactured products to Canada.

Mr. GRONNA. But the Senator realizes that we are trading with Canada in products of which we have a great abundance at home.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am not discussing with the Senator the technical question that he is seeking to raise now. I am presenting the fact that the result of the policy of mutual intercourse, mutual trading in agricultural products, without any bars imposed by us or by Canada, the result of that arrangement with this purely agricultural country, Canada, dealing with a partly agricultural and partly manufacturing country, the United States, is about \$100,000,000 a year in our favor.

We propose now by the pending bill to impose duties that will practically cut off, I should say, more than one-half of the agri-

cultural imports from Canada to this country in the future, thus making more acute this inequality against Canada in the exchange of agricultural products. I am not discussing the other questions which the Senator is raising. I am discussing the question of the effect of the legislation—

Mr. GRONNA. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. SIMMONS. Upon the future relations of the Canadian Government with this Government and our people, without any reference to the question to which the Senator is endeavoring to direct my attention.

Mr. GRONNA. If the Senator will permit me to refer to the fundamental principle of agriculture, the committee of which I have the honor to be the chairman is now considering the question of appropriations. Do I understand the Senator that he wants to discourage the production of agricultural products in the United States?

Mr. SIMMONS. Oh, the Senator does not understand me to be arguing any such thing as that. I am as much an agriculturist as the Senator from North Dakota. The Senator is not the only man in this body whose money is invested in farming. I wish to tell him that practically every dollar I have in the world, outside of that invested in my homes, is invested in agricultural lands which I operate and upon which I have sustained enormous losses during the last year. I have not received enough from some of my crops to pay for the fertilizer I put on them. Yet that does not blind me to the principle that is involved in the bill.

Mr. GRONNA. Nor does it blind the Senator from North Dakota.

I trust the Senator from North Carolina will not impute to me any motives that I am supporting the bill simply because I am interested in agriculture. I think I have shown on former occasions that such is not the case. If it were only a personal matter, I can assure the Senator from North Carolina that I would not be here asking for a tariff on any agricultural product, because I could afford to donate to the public the little holdings that I have and get out of the business and perhaps be better off, and perhaps the Senator from North Carolina would be better off if he would get out of his farming operations.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have no doubt about that; but I am not going to get out, nevertheless. I love the business. It is hereditary liking. I am the only member of my family, as far back as I can trace my ancestors on either side, who has not been a farmer and lived on the farm. I love the business, even though it is a mighty unprofitable business now, but I am not going to ask the public and I am not going to ask the American people to shoulder my losses.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator allow me to suggest that there are hundreds and probably thousands of people in my State and in eastern Montana and other places who are not so situated as the Senator? While they love the farm, they have got to get out of it because they are broke.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have no doubt about that. I know the farmers in the country are in desperate straits. I sympathize with them profoundly, and no one in this body sympathizes with them more keenly than I. If the bill is intended to pass the farmers' losses on to the general public, it will not have that effect, in my judgment, but if it should have that effect, I maintain that that is an illegal and unconscionable use of the taxing power of the country, and that we have no more right to pass legislation here for the purpose of allowing the farmers to recoup their losses, that they have unfortunately sustained this year, than we would have to pass a law to force money out of my pocket into the pocket of the Senator from North Dakota or out of his pocket into mine.

The people of the country as a whole have rights, and they ought to be respected by the lawmakers. The lawmakers have no right to provide that the losses of one class of the people shall be passed on to the balance of the people through the process of taxation.

But the Senator from North Dakota states that I am mistaken in that the exclusion of Canada's chief import, her chief reliance in paying us for things she needs from this country and must have, as the Senator says, will create no bad feeling on their part and is not likely to lead to any retaliatory legislation. I think the Senator is badly mistaken about that. I wish to read to the Senate a dispatch that appeared in the Evening Star of this city a day or two ago from Ottawa, Canada. It reads as follows:

OTTAWA, ONTARIO, January 27.

Indications multiply that Canada's new revised tariff is to be "Canadian all through."

Some members of parliament are already here for the February opening session, and if Washington goes ahead clapping on tariffs that will injure Canada, they make the following forecast—

That is just what we are doing; doing it admittedly, admittedly agreeing that we are imposing a specific duty here for the purpose of excluding the chief importations to this country upon which Canada relies. Here is the forecast of Canada's program to protect herself against us:

Preferential rates upon British goods, in order to promote trade within the Empire, in the conviction that trade within the Empire is good for Canada.

Preferential rates on manufactured products. The Senator says we have got certain manufactured products that Canada wants and must have, and that no amount of tariff that we can impose against her will keep her from buying those products from us. Here is the evidence that Canada is awake to the situation and that Canada understands how she can protect herself against unjust imposition in this country against her. One of the ways is, if we strike at her imports in agricultural products, that she will strike back at our exports of manufactured products. If we are going to exclude her agricultural products, then she will make a preferential rate with Great Britain in order to enable British goods to come in and take the place of the goods that Canada has heretofore been buying from us.

Mr. GRONNA rose.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will ask the Senator to let me finish. I want to get this forecast together.

Mr. GRONNA. I know the Senator wants to be fair.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator will admit that Canada has imposed a tariff upon the manufactures which we ship her while we are letting her products come in free.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understand Canada is going to give us an additional blow, for she is going to cut down her tariff to a minimum on goods coming from elsewhere, in order that the goods which she requires may come from Great Britain instead of her having to come here in order to get them.

Mr. McCUMBER. Canada has been talking about doing so for years.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; but she can now make it work, and that is the proposition.

The dispatch continues:

Probable incorporation in the schedules of the tariff arrangements arrived at last summer with the West Indies, in expectation of an enlarged exchange of goods with Canada.

A more favorable basis of reciprocal trade with Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and possibly with France.

In Ottawa semi-official circles it now is taken for granted that the Republican Party—

Meaning the Republican Party of the United States—

will cater to the demands of American farmers by materially increasing the tariff on all lines in which Canadian farmers are now so actively competing with the American agriculturist.

This is a warning to us that if we do this thing Canada will strike back with all her might. We are inviting a trade war with our neighbor, our best friend in the world, by the imposition of an outrageously protective duty upon practically all the chief agricultural products that she sends to this country.

Mr. President, I fear that condition of things, if we persist, will bring about not only a very strained relationship between us and Canada, but one that in the end will be extremely hurtful to the best interests of the people of this country.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. New in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do.

Mr. GRONNA. Does the Senator from North Carolina believe that any of the countries he has named—and I wish to ask him this question before he takes his seat—could compete with the American manufacturer on such commodities as farm machinery and automobiles and on machinery generally which is used upon the farm?

Mr. SIMMONS. In the production of the manufactured goods which Canada gets from this country I presume Great Britain, France, and Germany—especially Great Britain, which is one of the countries mentioned in the article—can compete with us. I have always understood the Republican Party to contend that on equal terms Great Britain could undersell us in our own market and in the markets of the world on such articles.

Mr. GRONNA. It has always been charged by some of the antiprotectionists that the American manufacturers were selling farm machinery manufactured in the United States cheaper in foreign countries than they sell it in the United States.

Mr. SIMMONS. And yet they claim that against those very foreign countries they must have protection for their products. The inconsistency of the theories of the protective tariff are beyond my comprehension, and I would not undertake, if the Senator will pardon me, to reconcile them.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator from North Carolina knows that outside of the establishments which are set up by American capital in any of the countries he has named no country can hope to compete with the American manufacturer on the manufactured articles which Canada buys from us.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I know that there may be a few manufactured products that Canada would have to continue to buy from this country, and it may be that agricultural implements would constitute one of them, but as to the manufactured articles which Canada buys from us, if preferential arrangements are made with Great Britain by which she can get them cheaper from Great Britain, she will have no difficulty in obtaining most of those manufactured goods there. It may be, as the Senator from North Dakota says, that in the matter of agricultural implements, in which we have specialized, we can sell them probably a little cheaper than almost any other country in the world, though I am not sure about that.

Mr. GRONNA. And on those very articles Canada imposes a heavy import tax, while we allow her products which compete with the products which we must raise in abundance to come into this country free.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; and we also put duties on Canadian manufactured products. She treats us with reference to manufactured products just as we treat her; she treats us with reference to agricultural products now just as we treat her or have been treating her; but not as we propose in the future to treat her. There is where the shoe pinches. When we do that, then we shall find Canada will be disposed to discriminate wherever she can against us as to our exports of manufactured products. If she can make satisfactory trade arrangements with Great Britain or with any other country on the face of the earth that treats her more equitably than we will if this bill becomes law, she will make such arrangements. The dispatch which I have read indicates that she is getting ready now, if the pending bill passes, to make such arrangements and put into operation such retaliatory measures as may be at her command.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I am prompted to add some further observations in connection with this discussion in view of a statement made by the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] in the course of his recent remarks. He asserted that as a matter of course the Canadian producer must get a better price for his wheat in this country than he can get in Canada, else why, he asked, would the importations be made into this country. And his colleague, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA], called attention to the fact that through one port of entry, the town of Portal, 90 carloads or 90 trainloads—

Mr. GRONNA. Nine hundred carloads.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Nine hundred carloads of wheat have entered during the present season.

Mr. GRONNA. During one month, the month of January.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Very well; during one month, or whatever the period was. These considerations are very readily understood to signify that the price of wheat in this country is necessarily depressed by reason of such heavy importations. It is sufficient to set out that so many million bushels of wheat came into this country from Canada within a month or within the last two months or within three months or within a year.

Mr. President, that does not signify anything at all. The town of Portal, to which the Senator refers, is on the Soo road, near the line between this country and Canada. That road runs northwest from Minneapolis through the States of Minnesota and North Dakota, partially through my State of Montana, and into the Canadian Provinces beyond. Of course, all other things being considered, all the shippers along the line of the Soo road will ship on the Soo line, and their wheat will necessarily go into Minneapolis as a terminal unless, of course, it is diverted by reason of a prohibitive tariff. So it is to be assumed that a large quantity of wheat grown along the line of the Soo road in the territory which it traverses will find its terminal market at Minneapolis. But it is to be borne in mind that American terminal ports offer very much more convenient shipping facilities for much of the Canadian wheat than the Canadian ports do, and naturally that wheat comes to this country in the processes of transshipment to European ports.

Prior to 1917, when there were reciprocal tariffs, such wheat all went through in bond, just as other commodities coming from a foreign country into this country for transshipment abroad were admitted in bond and transshipped without the payment of duty; but since 1917 it is not necessary to put in bond shipments of wheat from Canada coming into this country for transshipment abroad; yet there is a considerable quantity which, by reason of some advantages in shipment, comes into this country in bond and goes abroad. The figures with reference to that wheat refute the suggestion frequently made upon

the floor that none of the wheat that comes from Canada is of the quality that goes abroad.

Mr. President, unless it be a fact that our agricultural interests are seriously damaged by reason of the introduction of Canadian wheat, why should we refuse their carrying business in the United States? Why should we, in the case of the 900 cars of wheat that are carried over the Soo line through the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Minnesota, by a prohibitive tariff, divert that wheat to a Canadian line, to be carried over the Canadian line to the East, thus divesting railroad men in the three States mentioned of an opportunity to earn their living? Our local papers tell us that the Northern Pacific Railroad has cut its force something like 20 to 25 per cent in the last three months. It would result in a paralysis of industry in those sections, it seems to me, along the lines of all the international railroads to put into force such a prohibitive tariff upon wheat as is proposed. It would throw out of employment necessarily a vast number of men who are dependent upon their daily wages as railroad men in all that section of the country.

I now desire to prove, and to establish by evidence that can not be controverted that the wheat imported from Canada does go abroad, or that, if it does not, it simply releases other wheat that does go abroad. The Senator from North Dakota who advocates this measure with so much earnestness tells us briefly that the imported wheat is not exported at all; that the wheat we do export, amounting to some 200,000,000 bushels, is soft wheat grown in the Eastern States. It requires no sagacity whatever to appreciate that that wheat is released for export simply because of the other wheat that has come into the country from Canada, because if the additional amount that comes from Canada and is consumed in this country were not to come into this country the people in the eastern part of the country would be obliged to consume their own wheat, instead of exporting it abroad. They prefer to buy the flour that is made of our hard western and northwestern wheat, and to export their own wheat and their own flour; but if they could not get the other they would be obliged, as a matter of course, to rely upon the flour that was made from their own wheat.

Why, Mr. President, in a report made by the Tariff Commission only a short while ago into the causes of the present price of wheat, that body—and I do not know whether the Senator from North Dakota would stigmatize that as a free-trade body also or not—reported that among other reasons for the decline in the price of wheat was the record-breaking harvest of corn and oats. In other words, Mr. President, because we had a large quantity of oats and corn, the demand for wheat was not as great as it otherwise would be. In other words, there can not be the slightest doubt in the world that a high production of the soft wheat would affect the price of the hard wheat, and it is also indisputable that the introduction of the wheat from Canada necessarily releases the other wheat, even of the lower grades, for export.

Mr. President, I do not think it is quite sufficient to dispose of this report of the Tariff Commission by simply denouncing it as a free-trade commission. This commission was appointed pursuant to an act of Congress that was long demanded by the people, and in response to a public sentiment that was irresistible; and now, having gotten this commission—a bipartisan commission, for that matter—we are to destroy entirely whatever it may say upon these subjects, because, forsooth, those who are not satisfied with the reports it makes choose to characterize it as a free-trade commission!

But, Mr. President, the subject to which I am now referring has been made a matter of very earnest consideration, apparently, by the commission, judging from their report. They show in the report that it does not by any means follow that because there is a large quantity of wheat coming into this country from Canada the price of wheat in this country is at all depreciated; moreover, that there are many and very obvious advantages accruing to this country by reason of the introduction of this wheat from Canada, and that it does not signify a disaster to growers of wheat in America at all.

I read from page 6 of the report before alluded to, made to the Senate Committee on Finance under date of January 4, 1921, as follows:

From July 1 to November 30, 1920, there were imported from Canada approximately 24,000,000 bushels of wheat and its equivalent in flour (wheat, 21,563,119 bushels; flour, 423,804 barrels). Canada's exportable surplus is generally estimated to be 200,000,000 bushels. Ordinarily the greater part of her exports move in bond through American ports.

In the fiscal years 1916 and 1917, for instance, approximately 170,000,000 and 115,000,000 bushels, respectively, of wheat and its equivalent in flour were transshipped in bond through American ports.

Bear in mind, Mr. President, that in 1916 and 1917, 170,000,000 bushels and 115,000,000 bushels, respectively, were shipped in bond. That is to say, the wheat came into this country, and

went through this country, and went out of this country to some foreign country. It is not necessary any longer to ship that wheat in bond. It is shipped into this country and shipped abroad without going through the formality of placing it in bond. Accordingly, we can not resist the conclusion that this 900 carloads of wheat in a single month that came through the town of Portal is wheat the greater portion of which in all probability will be transhipped to foreign countries.

But it is significant that of her exports during the current crop year, inclusive of the month of November, only about 9,000,000 bushels were exported in bond. The period of closed navigation in the north, the fact that Canada could not take care of the peak movement during the open season, the superior shipping facilities at American ports, such factors have compelled shipments south of the border; and this transit trade has continued despite Canada's extensive transportation projects, designed in part to keep her grain moving via all Canadian channels. The natural route for her surplus is southward, for concentration, milling, or reexport.

There is a note which says:

There is a considerable, though much smaller, movement of American grain via Canadian ports, especially during the summer, before the Canadian harvest appears on the markets. In the first 10 months of 1920 wheat shipments through Canada amounted to around 12,000,000 bushels.

It was found a little more convenient in some sections of the country to ship to Canadian ports, in all probability for re-export abroad, just the same as they had been shipping into our country for reexport; but let me continue:

With the elimination of the tariff barrier the chief cause for bonding of wheat shipments south of the border has been removed. When account is taken of the extraordinary volume of so-called "domestic exports," of the small movement of bonded shipments, and of the large volume of imports, three-fourths of which were cleared at the two Lake ports, Buffalo and Duluth, it becomes apparent that much of the foreign wheat is reexported.

So that of the 900 carloads in a month coming through the town of Portal, in all probability a very considerable portion, and possibly the major portion, went right on to Liverpool.

It loses its identity after arrival at the elevators. These reexports are for the most part indirect, i. e., they may take the form of flour composed in whole or in part of Canadian wheat; domestic wheat of other classes and grades are released for export, or, finally, they may permit of larger exports from sections which formerly shipped to the importing region.

That seems to be the answer to the suggestion made by the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] that none of it goes abroad, but it does release other wheat in this country which is shipped abroad.

Thus much of this year's domestic hard spring wheat crop is of inferior quality, in the face of a domestic demand which desires especially the better grades. Commercial advices indicate that the Northwestern mills are blending much Canadian hard spring wheat with the lower grades of domestic spring, thereby affording a better market for much of the inferior domestic product. In Canada, a much larger proportion is usually of the better grades. Spring wheat millers are frequently faced with a shortage of the better grades of such wheat and have been compelled to draw increasing quantities of hard winter wheats from the States to the south.

I continue on the same page:

This free movement of wheat between the United States and Canada, making the North American crop a common source of supply, has certain demonstrable advantages. Its disadvantages are less certain. American lake vessels, which under the Canadian navigation laws, can not operate between Canadian ports, transport a large part of the Canadian grain; American elevators, distributing interests, and rail and ocean lines enjoy the benefits accruing from this larger volume of traffic; domestic mills, which had been losing ground to Canada in the export flour trade, are able to meet this competition through importing Canadian wheat for blending and milling; a larger volume of mill feed is available to the dairy industry, which consumes more mill feed than is yielded as a by-product of domestic flour consumption. Furthermore, the balance of trade, even in agricultural products, is heavily against Canada in her commerce with the States, and the resulting unfavorable rates of exchange are handicapping the American sales to Canada, at the same time that European shippers are enjoying an advantage by reason of unfavorable exchange with that country. Wheat is Canada's principal asset and her chief means of equalizing exchange rates.

Still another advantage is afforded by the practice of blending the heavier Canadian hard spring wheat with the lighter domestic wheats of the same class. Test weight per bushel is one of the chief standards which determines whether wheat shall be graded as No. 1 or falls under lower grades. By an admixture of a proper proportion of the Canadian product, domestic wheat which fails to grade as No. 1, solely by reason of deficient weight, may be classed under the higher grade and receive a correspondingly higher price. It is true that elevators and millers chiefly profit by this practice, but doubtless growers likewise profit to some extent through a more active domestic demand for the lower grades and through a lowering of the price spread between grades. In this connection it is worthy of note that the price in Liverpool of Manitoba No. 1 Northern is materially above that of American No. 1 Northern.

Against these advantages may be set off the possible disadvantages incident to the competition of Canadian flour in domestic markets and the possible influence of Canadian wheat upon the American farmers' price. However, the United States normally exported nearly three times as much flour as any other country, and the Canadian competition in flour is relatively not of large dimensions. Nor do Canadian mills possess obvious advantages over those operating south of the border. Buffalo mills, for instance, which are well situated with respect to the hard spring wheat producing sections of both countries, and also with respect to the hard winter and soft wheats, can compete with Canadian mills not only in the markets of the North Atlantic States but also in foreign markets for flour. It remains to consider, therefore, the possible effect of Canadian imports upon farmers' prices.

So, Mr. President, it is no answer at all merely to say that Canadian wheat is coming into this country. It does not by any means follow that the price in this country is depressed by reason of that fact.

The commission then goes into a consideration of the question as to how far, considering all of these circumstances, the price of wheat in this country is depressed by reason of the introduction of wheat from Canada. Upon that feature of the case I shall perhaps address the Senate at a later time. I merely rose to show the perfectly inconclusive character of the bare suggestion that because wheat is coming from Canada into this country it should be stopped because the American farmer is being ruined thereby. As shown here, there are many advantages that accrue by reason of the introduction of this wheat from Canada, and it by no means is established that the price in this country is reduced at all from that fact.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] a few moments ago brought out the fact that the rate in this bill on wheat represents an increase of 30 cents a bushel over the rate in the Underwood-Simmons Tariff Act.

On March 21, 1918, the proposition was before the Senate of increasing the price of wheat from the guaranteed price of \$2.20 to \$2.50 a bushel, an increase of 30 cents a bushel. I find that in the vote on that proposition the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] voted to increase the price of wheat from \$2.20 a bushel to \$2.50. I voted against the increase because the President had stated that his arrangements with the Allies were such that to increase the price above \$2.20 would seriously dislocate the plans under which the war was being fought.

I do not mention this fact by way of criticism, because I realize that those Senators were influenced by what they considered war conditions and war emergencies; but, Mr. President, I am equally justified to-day in voting for a similar rate of increase on account of conditions which I believe to be the direct outgrowth of war emergencies. I consider that present conditions affecting the wheat farmer, and affecting farmers in general, have grown directly out of war emergencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment, on page 2, line 1, to strike out "thirty" and insert in lieu thereof "forty."

Mr. SIMMONS. I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harrison	McKellar	Smoot
Brandegee	Hefflin	McNary	Spencer
Calder	Henderson	Moses	Stanley
Capper	Hitchcock	Myers	Sterling
Culberson	Johnson, Calif.	Nelson	Sutherland
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Thomas
Dial	Kellogg	Overman	Townsend
Dillingham	Kendrick	Page	Trammell
Elkins	Kenyon	Phelan	Underwood
Fall	Keyes	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	King	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Gay	Kirby	Ransdell	Warren
Gerry	Lenroot	Sheppard	Willis
Gronna	Lodge	Shields	Wolcott
Harris	McCumber	Smith, Ariz.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The question is on the first committee amendment, and the yeas and nays have been requested.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer my pair to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). I have a temporary pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. Were he here I understand he would vote "yea." I would vote "nay," if permitted to vote. I withhold my vote.

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] and vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH of Montana (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], who seems to be absent from the Chamber, unavoidably, I suppose. Being unable to procure a transfer of my pair,

I must withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. I transfer my pair to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. DIAL. I desire to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], is detained on public business. He has a general pair with the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING].

Mr. GLASS. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], and vote "nay."

Mr. KNOX. When my named was called I voted "yea" without recalling the fact that I am paired with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. In his absence I transfer my pair to the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL], who is absent, and being unable to obtain a transfer I must withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay," and I understand he would vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is absent on official business.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I have a general pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT], and being unable to obtain a transfer, in his absence I withhold my vote. If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN].

Mr. LODGE. I have a general pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—38.

Ashurst	Johnson, Calif.	McCumber	Smoot
Borah	Jones, N. Mex.	McLean	Spencer
Brandegee	Jones, Wash.	McNary	Sterling
Capper	Kellogg	Myers	Sutherland
Curtis	Kendrick	Nelson	Townsend
Dillingham	Kenyon	New	Wadsworth
Elkins	Knox	Page	Warren
Gay	La Follette	Phipps	Willis
Gooding	Lenroot	Ransdell	
Gronna	McCormick	Sheppard	

NAYS—28.

Beckham	Heffin	Moses	Smith, Ariz.
Culberson	Henderson	Overman	Stanley
Dial	Hitchcock	Phelan	Swanson
Gerry	Keyes	Pittman	Thomas
Glass	King	Reed	Underwood
Harris	Kirby	Shields	Walsh, Mass.
Harrison	McKellar	Simmons	Wolcott

NOT VOTING—30.

Ball	Fletcher	Norris	Smith, Md.
Calder	France	Owen	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Frelinghuysen	Penrose	Trammell
Colt	Gore	Polindexter	Walsh, Mont.
Cummins	Hale	Pomerene	Watson
Edge	Johnson, S. Dak.	Robinson	Williams
Fall	Lodge	Sherman	
Fernald	Newberry	Smith, Ga.	

So the first amendment of the Committee on Finance was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8881) for the relief of the First National Bank of New Carlisle, Ind.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 517) amending an act to provide for drainage of Indian allotments of the Five Civilized Tribes, approved March 27, 1914 (38 Stat., 310, Public No. 77).

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 8881) for the relief of the First National Bank of New Carlisle, Ind., and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

CHIEF GUNNER ROBERT EDWARD COX.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 73) in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask that the concurrent resolution just received from the House be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid the concurrent resolution before the Senate, and it was read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign a duplicate copy of the enrolled bill (H. R. 12469) entitled "An act to authorize the award of a medal of honor to Chief Gunner Robert Edward Cox, United States Navy," and that the Clerk of the House be directed to transmit the same to the President of the United States in compliance with his request.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask that the Senate concur in the House concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. JONES of Washington presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of Washington, relative to maintaining American training stations for instruction in the fundamentals of seamanship, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 4.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent as follows:

The United States Shipping Board is at the present time maintaining a training station at Seattle, Wash., for the purpose of training young Americans in the fundamentals of seamanship and of qualifying them to fill the positions of ordinary seamen, firemen, oilers, and galley-men on the ships of the new American merchant marine, such training being conducted on the training ship *Hollywood*, a combination cargo carrier and training ship especially constructed for the work, which is now and has been for the past six months engaged in carrying cargoes between Seattle, Honolulu, and San Francisco.

This is the only service in the country which offers an opportunity for young Americans who are desirous of entering sea life and serving on the ships of the American merchant marine to secure the requisite training to qualify them to fill even the most unskilled positions on such ships.

The unparalleled growth of our merchant marine during the past three years has created a great shortage of American seamen, which shortage still exists to such an extent that at the present time 36 per cent of the crews of the American ships sailing out of the port of Seattle are aliens and 75 per cent of the officers of such ships are not American born.

There should ever be borne in mind the lesson taught by the late war, when the greatest question before the country was how to get ships and the men to man them; when large numbers of alien seamen employed on American ships refused to man such ships on voyages through the war zone, but instead sought safety on coastwise runs or retired entirely from the sea until after the war was over, making it necessary to man such ships with untrained young Americans, where that was possible, or, as was unavoidable in a large number of cases, to tie them up entirely until American youths could be trained to man them, thus crippling the country's resources because of its lack of a trained body of American seamen.

The shipping interests of foreign nations are resorting to every practice to cripple the American merchant marine, and actual experience has proven that the subjects or former subjects of these countries who are now employed on American ships discriminate whenever possible against the young Americans who work under them and are attempting in every conceivable way to drive these Americans off the ships, and that unless the Shipping Board continues to assist more young Americans to go to sea and replace this element they will ultimately be successful in their efforts and the American merchant marine will be manned solely by men of foreign birth, as it was prior to the Great War.

The recruiting service of the United States Shipping Board has during the two and one-half years of its existence on the Pacific coast actually succeeded in reducing the percentage of alien seamen sailing out of the port of Seattle on American ships from 60 per cent to 36 per cent and is steadily continuing such reduction by replacing such aliens with young Americans trained in the service, and is performing a similar work in connection with the licensed personnel of such ships by means of its engineering and navigation schools conducted at the University of Washington and at other points throughout the country, where young Americans with the requisite amount of sea experience are prepared for their examinations for a license.

It is the belief of your memorialists that the vessels of the American merchant marine must be manned and officered by Americans if these ships are to be operated profitably and successfully in competition with the ships of other nations, which are manned by men who owe sole allegiance to the flag under which they sail.

Therefore your memorialists respectfully petition your honorable bodies that the present American merchant marine be retained under the American flag; that such merchant marine be manned solely by American citizens; that to this end there be maintained training stations and training ships upon which ambitious young Americans may receive an intensive course of training fitting them to fill these new positions; that the training station and training ship, as now conducted at Seattle and other ports of the country by the United States Shipping Board, be continued and broadened in scope until such time as the supply of American seamen is sufficient to meet every demand.

The secretary of state of the State of Washington shall immediately transmit five copies of this memorial to the Congress of the United States.

Passed by the senate January 18, 1921.

WM. J. COYLE,
President of the Senate.

Passed by the house January 26, 1921.

E. H. GUIE,
Speaker of the House.

Mr. JONES of Washington presented a memorial of Wapato Post, American Legion (of the Yakima Indian Reservation), of Wapato, Wash., protesting against the occupation by Japanese

of Indian lands upon the Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash., which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of the Norcatar Inter-County Farm Loan Association, of Norcatar, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation strengthening the Federal farm loan act, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented resolutions of Farmers' Local Union No. 1946, of Winfield; Farmers' Union Local No. 1831, of Cedar Vale; and Prairie Center Grange No. 1756, of Wellington, all in the State of Kansas, favoring legislation prohibiting gambling in grain products, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. MOSES presented a memorial of the president and sundry members of the faculty of New Hampshire State College, of Durham, N. H., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation commercializing the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SHEPPARD (for Mr. CHAMBERLAIN) presented a telegram from members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, regarding Federal highway construction, etc., which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., February 3, 1921.

GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The undersigned members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Oregon State Legislature, now in session, brought face to face in our work with the road-building program in which the State is engaged, and realizing the immense importance of a continuation of such programs in the several States of the Union, most earnestly request and urge your strongest efforts in support of the passage by the Senate of the Chamberlain-McArthur bill providing for Federal assistance in highway construction. We feel that this is the most important development movement in the United States; that it is absolutely nation-wide in its scope and in the benefits to accrue from its vigorous prosecution.

T. Vinton, W. H. Strayer, Gus C. Moser, Geo. W. Joseph, John Gill, C. M. Thomas, B. L. Eddy, O. B. Robertson, Charles W. Ellis, Robert S. Farrell, Colon R. Eberhard, Roy W. Rittner, Bruce Dennis, Wilson T. Hume, C. J. Edwards, Ben C. Sheldon, Frank Davey, Louis E. Bean, Chas. F. Hopkins, Oren R. Richards, K. K. Kubli, Earl E. Fisher, E. H. Belknap, Charles C. Hindman, Mrs. Wm. S. Kinney, Denton G. Burdick, C. E. Woodson, F. L. Hubbard, R. J. Carsner, Albert S. Roberts, Harvey Wells, H. J. Overturf, Philip Hammond, J. N. Johnston, Herbert Gordon, E. V. Carter, Jerry O. Powell, S. P. Pierce, Seward D. Allen, Walter G. Lynn, Sherman M. Miles, Geo. W. Hyatt, P. J. Gallagher, Herbert Engbert, D. E. Fletcher, Louis Lachmund, John B. Bell, I. L. Patterson, Isaac E. Staples, W. W. Banks, Jay Upton, Walter B. Jones, Wm. G. Hare, Charles Hall, Alex. M. Lafollette, Thos. F. Ryan, F. H. Porter, John B. Nickolsen, J. C. Smith, A. W. Norblad, Albert R. Hunter, Thos. B. Kay, Robert A. Acheson, Ed. Cary, F. R. Beals, P. D. Shank, Franklin B. Korell, Wm. M. Stone, W. R. McDonald, O. W. Hosford, S. A. Miller, Frank Sloan, A. M. Wright, E. N. Hurd, A. E. Westcott, David H. Looney, Charles Childs, W. T. Gordon, J. D. Lee, A. B. Flint, Arthur H. Marsh, T. T. Bennett, Barge E. Leonard, Ivan G. Martin, A. E. Shiria, J. C. Perry, E. C. McFarland, W. C. North, C. M. Lafollette, and W. C. Templeton.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WARREN. I report back favorably with amendments from the Committee on Appropriations the bill (H. R. 15422) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 755) thereon.

I wish to say a word concerning the bill. It provides an appropriation of nearly \$250,000,000 for the care of ex-soldiers who are sick and disabled, and makes several million dollars immediately available for providing more beds and hospital facilities for the sick. Hence I shall ask to-morrow morning in the morning hour to take up the bill and put it on its passage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

RELIEF OF WAR CONTRACTORS.

Mr. WALSH of Montana (for Mr. HENDERSON), from the Committee on Mines and Mining, to which was referred the bill (S. 4900) to amend section 5 of the act approved March 2, 1919, entitled "An act to provide relief in cases of contracts connected with the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes," reported it favorably with an amendment.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SHEPPARD (for Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, by request):

A bill (S. 4975) amending the act of March 4, 1917, for the restoration of the annuities of the two lower bands of Sioux Indians (known as Santee Sioux) and conferring jurisdic-

tion upon the Court of Claims therein; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 4976) to perpetuate the memory of the Chickasaw and Seminole Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 4977) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 4978) to provide for the disposal of certain waste and drainage water from the Rio Grande project, New Mexico-Texas; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 4979) granting a pension to Isola Foster (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. OWEN submitted an amendment proposing to pay \$312,811.27 to the Pawnee Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma in full and final settlement for the purchase by the United States of 170,333.37 acres of surplus land belonging to said Pawnee Tribe as provided by law, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$25,000 to defray the actual and necessary expenses on the part of the United States section of the Inter-American High Commission arising in such work and investigations as may be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted the following amendments (in accordance with the estimates submitted by the Bureau of Entomology) covering the work and investigations of the Bureau of Entomology, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed:

On page 50, in the items covering appropriations for the Bureau of Entomology, line 25, strike out "\$175,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$198,500";

On page 51, line 3, strike out "\$175,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$200,000";

On page 51, line 7, strike out "\$150,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$175,000";

On page 51, line 9, strike out "\$40,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$67,500";

On page 51, line 12, strike out "\$110,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$160,000";

On page 51, line 16, strike out "\$33,800" and insert in lieu thereof "\$38,800";

On page 51, line 20, strike out "\$51,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$66,500";

On page 51, line 25, strike out "\$52,330" and insert in lieu thereof "\$84,330";

On page 52, line 25, strike out "\$400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$600,000";

On page 53, line 9, strike out "\$275,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$400,000"; and

On page 53, line 11 (in the total for Bureau of Entomology), strike out "\$1,599,940" and insert in lieu thereof "\$—."

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Washington submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for study of the methods of prevention of losses by deterioration, decay, and freezing of fruits and vegetables in storage and transit, etc., from \$20,000 to \$40,000, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ASHURST submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for investigating the physiology of crop plants and for testing and breeding varieties thereof, from \$51,860 to \$66,860, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

AMENDMENT TO EMERGENCY TARIFF BILL.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona submitted the following amendment to House bill 15275, the emergency tariff bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed:

Page 3, at the end of line 11, insert: "Cotton having a staple of 1½ inches or more in length shall not be admitted into the United States from any foreign country during the 10 months succeeding the enactment of this bill."

EMERGENCY TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment of the Committee on Finance will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 3, after line 3, insert:

14. Fresh or frozen beef, veal, mutton, lamb, and pork, 2 cents per pound. Meats of all kinds, prepared or preserved, not specially provided for herein, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I thought the next amendment was as to wheat flour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No.

Mr. SIMMONS. I thought that was included in the agreement covering the wheat item. If it was not considered in that agreement, I ask that we reconsider the action of the Senate with reference to wheat flour.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no committee amendment there.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask unanimous consent that the vote of the Senate with reference to wheat flour, agreeing to that provision of the House text, be reconsidered, because I desire at the proper time to request a yea and nay vote upon that question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Nothing has been agreed to with reference to that matter.

Mr. SIMMONS. I misunderstood the Chair then. I understood the Chair to state that there was an agreement regarding it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There was not.

Mr. SIMMONS. As I was not here at the time, I would like the Chair to state what took place.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This morning in Committee of the Whole, without objection, the amendment in line 1, page 2, changing the duty on wheat from 30 to 40 cents per bushel was agreed to, and the amendment in line 13, page 2, reading "except rice cleaned for use in the manufacture of canned foods," was agreed to. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] asked unanimous consent that the vote whereby the change was made in the rate on wheat from 30 to 40 cents per bushel might be reconsidered, which was agreed to, but the amendment with reference to cleaned rice for use in manufactured foods was not reconsidered.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will not ask to have any reconsideration of that amendment. I understood, though of course I was mistaken about it, that action had been taken with reference to the provision in the House text as to wheat flour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no change in the House text on wheat flour.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understood, if the Chair will pardon me, that there was a vote taken as to whether the Senate would concur in the House provision.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That will come under a general vote on the bill, unless the Senator moves to strike out the clause or to amend it in some way.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is what I wished to know. I understand now that we are operating under a rule by which we are to consider first the committee amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is true. The amendment on page 3 just read by the Secretary is now the pending question.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, Senators will observe that, in the pending amendment on page 3 there is a repetition of "mutton, lamb," as found in subdivision 13 of the bill as it came from the House, with the exception that it provides in subdivision 14 for "fresh or frozen beef, veal, mutton, lamb, and pork." So as the amendment now stands there would be two rates upon fresh mutton and lamb, one of 2½ cents per pound in subdivision 13 of the bill, and the other of 2 cents a pound in subdivision 14 of the bill.

I wish simply to state that if the amendment offered as to subdivision 14 is agreed to, then subdivision 13 ought to be stricken out of the bill, providing 2 cents a pound on mutton and lamb. If that rate is not satisfactory, then the only other course to pursue would be to insert the words "or frozen" after the word "fresh" in subdivision 13, line 3, page 3, so that it would read, "fresh or frozen mutton or lamb, 2½ cents a pound," and then in the proposed amendment inserting subdivision 14 we would have to strike out the words "mutton, lamb," as found in line 4 on page 3 in subdivision 14, so that there would not be a duplication or repetition of rates. So far as I am concerned I think the best thing to do is to agree to the Senate committee amendment including mutton and lamb and then make an amendment in the House text by striking out subdivision 13.

Mr. POMERENE. What would be the reason for making a distinction in rate?

Mr. SMOOT. There should be no distinction.

Mr. POMERENE. I agree with the Senator that, if there should be any tariff at all, there should be no distinction.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the amendment ought to be agreed to so that it will take care of fresh and frozen beef, veal, mutton, lamb, and pork at 2 cents a pound, and when the amendment is agreed to then I shall ask the Senate to further amend by striking out subdivision 13 entirely.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only a moment. I am satisfied that the Senate has made up its mind that it is going to put the bill through, and the question of how much tax it is necessary for the American people to pay to get the bill is not a question that concerns the Senate at all. But it might be well enough in passing just to consider the facts and conditions which confront us in these items.

The bill proposes a tax on fresh or frozen beef, veal, mutton, lamb, and pork of 2 cents a pound. I think the so-called Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act gave the highest rate of duty that was ever theretofore given by a Republican law on fresh meats, and it fixed the tax at 1½ cents per pound. The present law practically places beef on the free list.

In considering the organization of a tariff bill we may consider it from the standpoint of protection to the American industry as the primary object, or we may consider it from the standpoint of revenue. From the standpoint of protection the best thought of the Republican Party has never heretofore advanced further than 1½ cents a pound. From the standpoint of revenue, those who believe in a revenue tariff have found that the revenue derived from this source was so infinitesimal in comparison with the great volume of production in business, and this being one of the necessities of life that every man must have who desires to live and maintain his family in a healthy condition, that every one of those articles was placed on the free list eight years ago by the present tariff law.

Of course, when that bill was passed it was predicted freely that dire distress and disaster would come to many industries, among others the beef industry; but in the last eight years it has not been demonstrated that the beef industry was seriously injured, and, as a matter of fact, there was no complaint coming from that source until we ran into antinatural war conditions and found the country facing financial difficulty throughout affecting every class of production. Then, gentlemen desiring to create special privileges for special interests concluded it was a good time to avail themselves of conditions and attempt to write a tariff bill that would cut off competition from abroad. But let us see for a moment what that competition amounts to.

A man may come into one's office and say, "We are entitled to protection for this industry. A million pounds or a million tons or a million bales of some commodity are coming into this country seriously endangering this great business." That is a matter of comparison. A million tons of one commodity, where the production in the country is small, might indicate an overflow of the home market and the absolute destruction of the American industry. On the other hand, a million tons of production of another commodity might be so small in comparison with the great productive capacity of the country that it would be infinitesimal in comparison. We can not, therefore, simply say that there are imports coming into the country in large quantities and therefore we are entitled to be protected against them, but we must compare the imports and the American production first before we can ascertain the real equation involved. Then we should look to the exports of the same commodity to determine whether it has been demonstrated that American production can go abroad and compete in markets in foreign fields where they do not stand behind a tariff wall.

Now just look at the figures. The figures I am giving the Senate are not my figures; they have not been prepared by me. I hold in my hand the Summary of Tariff Information, prepared by the Republican Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives for the year 1920. They take the articles of fresh beef and veal and say that the domestic production was 3,658,000,000 pounds, in round figures, valued at \$421,000,000. Then they say further down in the report that the imports amounted to 24,000,000 pounds, valued at \$3,400,000; in other words, measured in bulk or in American dollars, the imports that have come into this country in competition with the American product amount to about 1 per cent or to less than 1 per cent. It is very dangerous to American industry that it only has 99 per cent of the American market in which to exploit itself.

Mr. POMERENE. Was the amount that came in by way of imports, 24,000,000 pounds?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The imports amounted to 24,781,719 pounds.

Mr. POMERENE. Was that during the year 1919?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That was in the year 1918.

Mr. POMERENE. That is about one-quarter of a pound for each man, woman, and child in the country.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator from Ohio can make his mental calculations faster than I can, but I am sure his figures are correct.

Now, let us look at the exports. The exports in 1918 were 370,000,000 pounds, valued at \$67,000,000—\$67,000,000 of exports as compared with \$3,000,000 of imports—\$67,000,000 going to the competitive markets of the world, often having to go into a market where the product meets a tariff wall before it can enter at all and must go behind that tariff wall to meet competition.

Mr. President, I do not think it is necessary for us to go further. I know that my words in debate on this bill are going to accomplish nothing; but to say that the life of this industry is really challenged from abroad is to dispute the facts that are shown by the publications of the Republican Party itself. Whether one be a Republican protectionist or a tariff-for-revenue Democrat, I ask, Where are we going to obtain the revenue for the Government at the customhouse if we are not going to allow some importations to come through the tariff wall? Can we expect less, if we are going to divide with the Government at all, than to allow 1 per cent to enter the country—just 1 per cent—from which our Government may derive some revenue with which to support itself? No; the authors of the pending bill seem to have abandoned the Government or are regardless of the effect the proposed legislation may have in the preservation of the revenues of the Government. They seem to be so absolutely callous to the proper principles of taxation that they are willing to attempt to put practically a prohibitive tariff at the customhouse in order that they may levy a consumption tax—for that is what it amounts to, a tax that is divided according to numbers and not divided according to wealth—upon the great mass of the American people.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. President—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HENDERSON. Has the Senator from Alabama the figures for any other year than the year 1918, when we were engaged in the World War?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. This book does not give those figures, but I could readily get them for the Senator. I have been reading from a Republican textbook, but I am satisfied if I took the trouble to gather the figures myself and selected the years the figures for which I wanted to exploit before the Senate they would sustain to even a greater extent the argument that I am making than those which I take from a Republican textbook.

I know that it is easy for advocates of high protective tariff duties to present the argument that there are many million dollars' worth of a certain product coming into the country and threatening an industry, but they do not take the trouble to state what the amount of the American production is. However, no man who understands this particular proposition can deny that from beginning to end the imports coming into this country are limited.

I have studied the question in the past from top to bottom. There is a limitation written on the high seas which controls the question and which can not be overcome. That is the hold of a ship. Ships can not be run successfully and be made refrigerator ships from top to bottom, because then they would not be prepared to carry an outgoing cargo. The refrigeration space of a ship, its meat-carrying capacity, must be limited; and of necessity it is only within the space which is set apart for refrigeration in the ships of the world that competitive beef can cross the hot latitudes of the Equator and enter the American market in such condition that it may be sold. So there is a natural limitation if there were no tariff wall at all.

Mr. President, this bill is brought here without consideration and without investigation. There is no reason for this tax, except in certain markets around the eastern seaboard, to increase the cost of living on many people who can ill afford to pay the additional tax; and there is no justification whatever, either in past history or future speculation, for writing a tax at the customhouse of 2 cents a pound on this commodity. I know, however, it is idle for me to speak, and I do not care to take up the time of the Senator further.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Senator might well have referred to the effect which this proposed legislation necessarily will have in provoking counter legislation of a retaliatory character. I have a clipping from the New York Times of yesterday which, with his consent, I will read into the Record as a fitting conclusion to his remarks.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. It contains a telegram from Buenos Aires of date the 2d of February, and is as follows:

As a measure of retaliation for the Fordney tariff bill now before the United States Senate, Deputy Saccone announced to-day his intention to introduce a bill in the Argentine Parliament providing for a levy of duties of 40 per cent on all goods imported from countries increasing their import duties in such manner as to affect Argentine exports.

Deputy Saccone severely criticized the policy of the Republican Party in the United States, which, he said, was behind the Fordney bill. He declared the real purpose of the bill was to make the United States the creditor of the South American Republics, raise a tariff wall against their imports, and then forcibly decrease South American gold holdings by requiring the debtor republics to pay their trade balances in gold.

Deputy Saccone asserted the time had come for Argentina to assert itself and let it be known she was not dependent on the United States for imported merchandise, "with our great supplies of raw materials," he said, "we can go to any market in the world on a firm footing."

What Argentina proposes is doubtless what will be proposed by all other countries which are affected by this measure, and it does affect all countries which have any exportable food products. It is designed, and must be designed, to affect them, because the consequences of the bill in that regard are so apparent.

During his many discussions of the war and of the conditions of peace the President emphasized the necessity for doing away with those economic rivalries which contain within themselves the plans and purposes of war. There can be no such thing, Mr. President, as a unification, even in sentiment of the people of the world if they are engaged in competitive economic rivalries such as this bill will necessarily provoke.

The trade of South America is at our door. It may be that we can secure it by banning all of their products from our shores and successfully compete with nations which do not follow that insensate policy. I do not believe that the importation of frozen mutton and beef into this country is an evil.

A witness before the Finance Committee said there were 2,700,000 carcasses in the city of New York to-day, brought there from New Zealand and from Argentina. If that be so, then they are either cornered and withheld from public consumption or else these carcasses enter into the supply of the eastern seaboard. In either event they supplement a much-needed necessity of life; and to strike that business in the face by prohibitory legislation necessarily is to raise the price of living, as the Senator from Mississippi said this morning, by penalizing the virtual necessities of life.

I am surprised that this paragraph of the bill excludes poultry. Taken with the other paragraphs of the bill, it virtually places a prohibitory tariff upon all meats except fish and fowl. I should not wonder at all but that we have some importations of poultry into this country from that neighbor whose prestige we fear so terribly just now—Canada. Possibly a Mexican chicken gets across the border once in a while. I do not know; but there is a menace, Mr. President. There is the menace in the air.

I have no doubt that when the great tariff bill of next year comes before the Senate it will have a duty upon eggs, because the papers announce that enormous quantities of eggs are being imported into the United States from China, and they are packed so carefully that they come without serious loss. To my mind that suggests the need of a compensatory duty on poultry. The American hen, the manufacturer of the domestic egg, certainly should receive some compensatory benefit from the existing duty upon a competitive product from abroad, and we ought to anticipate this tax upon the eggs of Chinese hens by providing right now something that will compensate the American hen for its undue and excessive labors at this time.

If this measure were perfect, therefore, it would comprise poultry as well as fresh and frozen beef, veal, mutton, lamb, and pork, and the microscope of the protectionist is so exquisitely perfect that I am surprised that the dealer in poultry has up to this time overlooked the need of including poultry in this bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That matter has already been taken care of. The Democratic tariff, the Underwood-Simmons Act, has a tariff on both eggs and poultry.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I do not know whether that is so or not, but of course I take the Senator's word for it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have the law before me and can quote from it.

Mr. THOMAS. If that is true, then, of course, that being provided for, all of the meat foodstuffs of the world, except fish, are included; and perhaps the Senator can find fish provided for, nicely plastered with a tariff duty, so as to make it palatable to the American consumer.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, it is true, I think, that under the Underwood bill there is a duty on both eggs and poultry; but what I understand the Senator to be contending for is a compensatory duty in favor of poultry.

Mr. THOMAS. That is what I had in mind.

Mr. SIMMONS. There is no compensatory duty of that kind in the Underwood bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think that tariff bill provides for live poultry. I do not think it deals with the other kind.

Mr. THOMAS. That may be. I do not pretend to remember all of the items in the Underwood bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There is a Democratic tariff on fish, also.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank God for that! Then the American consumer can get nothing in the way of meat food without being taxed for it. That rounds out the whole, and makes his condition one of contentment and satisfaction.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is a revenue tariff.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, yes; that is a revenue tariff, but I shall not go into that.

The Senator from Alabama, I believe, referred to the fact that there is a slight duty upon frozen meats, or meats from other countries, a revenue duty. The fact, therefore, that the Underwood bill comprises eggs and poultry should not have deterred our friends who prepared this bill from recognizing the present emergency which threatens the extinction of these basic industries, and increasing that duty so as to preserve them; because, if it be true that the American hen is threatened with extinction—and I think it is threatened with extinction just as much as any other business that is covered by this bill—then certainly we owe it to posterity, to the present generation, and to all lovers of chicken and turkey, to perpetuate and to preserve those industries by taxing them just as high as possible.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, as I understand, we are now called on to vote upon subdivision 14, which places a tax of 2 cents a pound upon fresh or frozen beef, veal, mutton, lamb, and pork. In the Underwood bill those meats were on the free list.

I notice that in the report of the Federal Trade Commission they state that the five big packers, who would receive the benefit of this protection, control very largely the fresh and frozen meat industry in this country. Of cattle, for instance, they control 75 per cent; of calves, 66 per cent; of sheep and lamb, 78.6 per cent.

Then, I find in the same report that the five big packers now have, or did have at the time this report was filed, frozen beef in storage that would be protected under this provision to the amount of 62,535,507 pounds. In other words, 95 per cent of all the frozen beef that is in cold storage in this country, or was in cold storage in the country at the time this report was filed, was controlled by the five big packers.

Of smoked ham and bacon, 64.1 per cent is held in storage by the five big packers, approximating 10,702,402 pounds.

Of dry salt pork, they controlled 69.8 per cent, or 142,069,065 pounds.

Of pickled pork, 70½ per cent, or 219,887,142 pounds.

So what it is proposed to do here not only will increase the price of the meat used on the breakfast table and needed by the poor and the rich alike, but it will be in favor of those concerns that control from 65 to 90 per cent of the frozen beef in the country.

I asked one of the retail merchants some weeks ago to give me the retail price of meats. You know, if you have looked over the bills that have come to you, that meats are one article that you have been forced to purchase that has not decreased in price very much. I find from this price list that on November 15, 1919, the price of sirloin steak, for instance, was 39 cents, but on November 15, 1920, it was 43½ cents—an increase of 4½ cents.

I find on round steak, that on November 15, 1919, at the retail stores in Washington, the price was 36 cents, and on November 15, 1920, it had increased to 39.6 cents.

I find, on rib roast, that on November 15, 1919, the price at retail in Washington was 30 cents, and on November 15, 1920, it was 32.6 cents—an increase of 2.6 cents.

On chuck roast, on November 15, 1919, the price was 24 cents, and on November 15, 1920, it had increased to 25 cents.

On pork chops, on November 15, 1919, the price was 42 cents, and on November 15, 1920, it was 44 cents.

On bacon, on November 15, 1919, the price was 51 cents, and on November 15, 1920, it was 53 cents.

If the majority of the Senate want to continue to increase the high cost of living on the meats that every person in this country must have, in view of the fact that they have continued to go up, then let them vote "aye" on the pending proposition.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. STANLEY. The Senator probably recalls that the Progressive platform of 1912 contained a declaration against the imposition of a duty upon any commodity controlled by a trust or combination.

Mr. HARRISON. By any trust in this country; yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky made a very eloquent speech the other day, telling us that the packers were not a trust.

Mr. STANLEY. The Senator from Texas is in error. I explicitly said that I had no knowledge as to whether or not the packers were guilty of a combination in restraint of trade; that if they were, they ought to be sent to the penitentiary; but that I was in favor of adequate and rational legislation to reach them, and I believed in bringing them into a court and trying them as criminals, and not having them passed on by some commission here in Washington that could have no direct knowledge of their activities.

Mr. HARRISON. Since the Senator has asked me the question, it may be well to put into the Record at this time an extract from the platform of the Democratic Party in 1908—the platform that was framed in Denver. I read in part the plank on the tariff question of the Senator's party and my party:

We favor immediate revision of the tariff by the reduction of import duties. Articles entering into competition with trust-controlled products should be placed upon the free list.

That we did in the Underwood tariff law so far as frozen meats were concerned, and the necessities of life.

Material reductions should be made in the tariff upon the necessities of life, especially upon articles competing with such American manufactures as are sold abroad more cheaply than at home; and gradual reductions should be made in such other schedules as may be necessary to restore the tariff to a revenue basis.

I read a part of the tariff plank in the platform adopted by the Democratic Party in Baltimore, in 1912:

We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic Party that the Federal Government, under the Constitution, has no right or power to impose or collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue, and we demand that the collection of such taxes shall be limited to the necessities of government honestly and economically administered.

The high Republican tariff is the principal cause of the unequal distribution of wealth. It is a system of taxation which makes the rich richer and the poor poorer. Under its operations the American farmer and laboring man are the chief sufferers.

We favor the immediate downward revision of the existing high, and in many cases prohibitive, tariff duties, insisting that material reductions be speedily made upon the necessities of life. Articles entering into competition with trust-controlled productions—

And if this is not a trust-controlled product, I have not heard it contradicted—

Articles entering into competition with trust-controlled products and articles of American manufacture which are sold abroad more cheaply than at home should be put upon the free list.

Now I read in part from the Democratic platform of 1916:

We reaffirm our belief in the doctrine of a tariff for the purpose of providing sufficient revenue for the operation of the Government economically administered and unreservedly indorse the Underwood tariff law as truly exemplifying that doctrine.

In the Underwood tariff law, as I have stated, frozen meats are placed upon the free list. I continue reading:

We recognize that tariff rates are necessarily subject to change—

And so forth.

I submit these for the Record, Mr. President.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, I understand that the great portion of this meat comes from New Zealand, and that the packers have been excluded from that country. If it be true that the five packers are in a combination in restraint of trade, and are demanding extortionate prices for meats prepared for the American market, the best proof of it, the most accurate demonstration of the existence of such a combination and the extent of the extortion, will be found, necessarily, in the difference between the price of fresh meats produced in a country over which the packers have no control, and a market into which they can not go, and the price charged for the same commodity in the United States.

As far as combinations of the packers or others are concerned, I am firmly of the opinion that the Federal Congress will make a great mistake if it ceases to treat the forming of a combination in restraint of trade as an offense, as a crime akin to treason, in that it reaches the whole Nation, and we should not arm a commission or any other body with the right to grant plenary indulgence, to say when a combination is permissible and when it is not permissible. I am in favor of a rigorous enforcement of existing antitrust legislation against a packer or anybody else who enters into such a combination, and if such a combination exists I believe that we will destroy the best evidence of its extent and the effect of its operations by impos-

ing upon a free market a duty that will conceal the difference in price between the beef, pork, and mutton imported from New Zealand and that sold by the packers in the United States.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I have not taken much time in this debate, and I do not intend to make any extended remarks now. I simply want to call attention, however, to the difference between the position which has just been taken by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] and other Senators on this side of the Chamber and the position which I take at this time.

We have listened to the reading of planks of the Democratic platforms for several presidential campaigns in the past. I do not believe that they are relevant to the question which now confronts the Senate and the country. I do not believe we are dealing with this question as we should deal with it or would deal with it were we in normal times. I look upon this day and these months as a part of the war period. It is my judgment that this great Government of ours should not have undertaken to simply drop our policy with regard to economic conditions immediately upon the signing of the armistice. I believe this Government, which assumed such extraordinary powers during the war, should have continued to function with respect to conditions which inevitably must follow a war. I believe this is a war condition and that we should try to do something to ameliorate the very disastrous conditions which are found in this country from one side to the other, wherever the producers of this country are involved.

The farmers are in a different situation from the manufacturing interests of the country. The manufacturer can close up his factory, he can bank his fires, but the farmers of the country produce their crops annually. A great many of the crops have been produced, and in the great percentage of instances the crop is still in the hands of the farmer. In one little town in the State of New Mexico there are stored to-day over 3,000,000 pounds of wool, for which there is no market. So these conditions are not to be dealt with as we would deal with questions in ordinary times of peace.

Senators talk about the price of meat in the city of Washington as you get it in the retail store. I agree that that has no relation whatever to the price which the farmer receives for his cattle. So I want to insist that the arguments which are being used here with respect to a tariff in ordinary times have no relevancy in the debate upon this bill.

This is intended as an emergency measure, for the purpose of trying to maintain the status quo until the Government can deal with questions upon a peace basis and under normal conditions. If we consider this is a question as arising under war conditions, then why should we not preserve the American market for those people who produce these commodities, who have produced them at the enormous expense necessarily incurred during the time the production was going on?

There are millions of pounds of meat being brought into this country. It had been stored up in New Zealand during the war because of the want of an outlet. The same condition exists in Argentina and other South American countries, and if you are going to practically put an embargo upon wheat, upon rice, upon beans, and upon other commodities, I submit there can be no good reason why there should not be an embargo, or at least a considerable tariff tax, upon the importation of meat. The House bill put a tariff upon live cattle, and if that be a just tariff, then it seems to me it should follow, as a necessary consequence, that the amendment placing this tax in the bill ought to be agreed to. If we are going to have an emergency bill at all to act as an embargo, or partial embargo, then I submit no reason can be suggested why this tariff should not be put upon fresh and frozen beef and other meats.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, if the duty on frozen beef should be reflected with any degree of certainty whatever in the price the producers of live stock can secure for their products, a tariff of this character would appeal to me with particular force. There is very much of merit in the suggestion now made by the Senator from New Mexico, that when we come to deal with those articles which were accumulated abroad as the result of war conditions, and particularly when we come to deal with those articles which were accumulated here as a result of war conditions—wool, as a characteristic example—a very powerful argument is addressed to any legislative body, altogether aside from the considerations which address themselves when we come to consider a tariff dealing with normal conditions and to be operative in normal conditions.

But, Mr. President, it must be recognized, I am sure, by everyone who reflects upon this matter at all that a tariff bill

imposing a duty upon the importation of frozen meats inures to the immediate benefit, not of the growers of live stock at all, but of the great packers of this country, who come into competition in their products with the meats thus imported into the country. If, accordingly, they would raise the price which they paid to the producers of the live stock sold in the live-stock markets of the country, there would be much in the argument of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES].

But in the discussion here, only the other day, in connection with the packers' bill some very important and significant figures were presented by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], showing that no such condition of things exists, and nobody undertook to refute those figures, which were furnished by the Bureau of Markets in the Department of Agriculture. It was clearly disclosed by those charts—and they were very elaborately prepared—that there is no kind of relation between the wholesale prices charged by the packers in this country and the prices which they pay to the live-stock producers for the cattle and sheep and hogs that come upon the market. It was disclosed clearly by those figures that not infrequently, when the price of live stock was on the descent, going down every day, the wholesale price charged by the packers to the retailers throughout the country rose, and that the changes were not at all reflected.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, does the Senator realize that the fact that meats from foreign countries have been brought into this country has been used as an argument by the packers for the reduction of the price for domestic live cattle?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. There is no doubt in the world about that. The packer will tell you, "Just see the enormous amount of meat coming into this country; this is all we can pay." Others say exactly the same thing with respect to wool. As the Senator knows, frequently a combination exists, and that is used merely as an excuse. The fact about the matter is their own records disclose that they do not reduce their wholesale prices as the price they are required to pay to the producer for his cattle descends, nor do they increase their price always in accordance with the increased price which the market conditions require them to pay.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I fully agree with the Senator that the conditions regarding the meat supply of the United States are deplorable. I do not believe that there is any just relation between the retail price of meat and the price which the producer receives. But the packers give it out to the country that here are these various cargoes of meats coming into the United States in competition with the home supply, and my information is that those very packers who are the ones who bring them here and then use them as an excuse for paying to the producer whatever they are willing to pay. The adoption of the amendment, if it prohibits the importation of those meats from foreign countries, would at least take away from the packers that pretended excuse.

I do not mean to say at all that the law of supply and demand governs the meat business of the country as it is conducted at this time. Whether the bill does anything more than to take away from the packer the mere excuse which he conjures up for the purpose of depressing the price to the producer, I think we shall at least have gotten some benefit from the bill.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I quite agree with the Senator that that is all the benefit there is in it. It does, as a matter of fact, take away from the packer the excuse for reducing the price—that is, that particular excuse—but it is very easy for him to conjure up some other excuse just as poor.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I would like to inquire of the Senator if it takes away the excuse for reducing the price to the producers? If we put a duty on these frozen imports into this country will it not give him an excuse to raise the price?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Undoubtedly, and the way it appears to me is exactly as is now indicated by the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. Whether importations to this country amount to much or little, he would be furnished with an excuse for raising the price to the wholesaler?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. For raising the price to the wholesaler, beyond a doubt. But the point I make is that I think it will deprive the packer of that excuse for paying a lower price to the producer than the market conditions will fairly warrant him in paying.

But what price do the people of the United States pay for taking that excuse away from the packer? There is no doubt in the world that he will immediately advance to the wholesaler the price that he would otherwise charge, to the extent of the amount of the tariff that is exacted by the bill. He will say, "I am obliged to raise my price to you by reason of the fact that a tariff is put upon that product." Importations will not

come into competition with his product and he is in a situation to raise the price to the wholesaler. Just stop, good people, and reflect upon what it means to the people of the United States to pay 2 cents a pound upon every pound of meat they consume over and above what they would otherwise be obliged to pay.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. May I ask the Senator if he does not believe that the meat situation is now such that they are charging for meat all that the traffic will bear anyhow?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course, I do not know about that. That presents a rather difficult question. Of course, if meat goes to a prohibitive price people will not eat meat, and therefore the sales will lessen. It is a question of business prudence as to whether the price will go higher or not, or whether it will be possible to shove the price higher.

The point I am making is that the people of the United States are asked to pay for the removal of that excuse a sum that is simply staggering in its enormity, and I can not bring myself to assent to it. It would be an awful price to pay, even though the price were raised accordingly to the producer of the live stock, for I am perfectly satisfied that it will not change the price to the producer of live stock by one penny. The packers will pay just exactly what the conditions will require them to pay, considering their own private individual interests, and nothing more. I am sure they will pay nothing more by reason of the duty, and accordingly I do not believe that we can reflectingly adopt the policy.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I know, as the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has stated, that the majority in the Chamber have made up their minds to adopt all these amendments. Nothing that we can say or do in the way of exposing the iniquity of them and the burdens that they will place upon the people without compensating advantages to anybody will avail anything. Yet I feel that the opponents of the bill owe it to the country and to themselves to present the facts with reference to the several items, and it is with that view alone that I am discussing them, and not because I expect to influence the action of the Senate in the slightest.

The Senator from Alabama a little while ago gave some figures showing the production of beef products in this country. I have sent out and obtained statistics showing the total production of meat products for the year 1919 in this country, and find that the total amount of these products for that year was 24,884,000,000 pounds in round numbers. I find that there was imported into the country in the year 1920 of the products of beef and veal, 42,000,000 pounds in round numbers, valued at \$6,962,000. I find that there was imported during the first 10 months of the calendar year 1920 of lamb, mutton, and pork, 78,000,000 pounds, valued at \$10,000,000. It is apparent that the Senator from Alabama was right when he stated that the importation of those products was possibly not over 1 per cent of the production. I doubt whether it was as much as 1 per cent. I have not calculated it, but I think it must be less than 1 per cent.

I do not understand how anyone whose knows the primary principles of the tariff in its effect upon domestic prices could possibly contend that an importation amounting to about 1 per cent of the total production of the country could possibly affect the prices of that product in that country. The only way that importation can affect the prices is when they come in in sufficient volume with relation to domestic production as to bring the domestic prices down to the level of the foreign prices. If the imports are relatively negligible they can not have that or any other effect upon domestic prices.

But the ground upon which the duty is asked is that it will have the effect of raising the price of live stock in this market. That could not be possible in those conditions. Every one understands that when we are producing only about one-half of our consumption of a product, as in the case of sugar, for instance, that the importations of the other half holds the price here down to the level of the foreign price. If we impose a duty it raises the price here that much above the level of the foreign price. But that is not true where the importations are relatively small as compared to our production or negligible as compared to our exports, as they are in this case, because while we imported last year of beef products valued, as I said, at about \$7,000,000, we also exported \$32,000,000 in value, more than four times as much as we imported, and therefore either from the standpoint of a comparison of imports to exports or from the standpoint of a comparison of imports to production, the duty could not possibly raise the price of live stock or of meat products in this country, either to the extent of the duty or to any appreciable extent.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator has just stated that imports of meat products during the year 1920 were approximately \$7,000,000 worth. Can the Senator give that in pounds?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes. In 1920 the beef and veal products, in round numbers, were 42,000,000 pounds.

Mr. POMERENE. For the year?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; in that year. The first 10 months of the year mutton, lamb, and pork imports were 78,000,000 pounds, in round numbers.

Mr. POMERENE. Forty-two million pounds of beef and mutton?

Mr. SIMMONS. That was beef and veal, and 78,000,000 pounds of mutton, lamb, and pork.

Mr. POMERENE. If the Senator will permit me to carry out his thought a little further, we have, then, 42,000,000 pounds coming into the country in one year. That means two-fifths of a pound in one year for each man, woman, and child.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator is about right as to beef and veal products.

Mr. POMERENE. Certainly two-fifths of one pound could not so very materially reduce the price as to injure the stock raiser.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; or, in round numbers, about 150,000,000 pounds of fresh meat come into this country as against a production of 24,000,000,000 pounds here. Mr. President, I think it is perfectly clear—and I want to put these facts before the Senate as quickly as I can without elaborating them—that the small importation will not raise the price of live stock in this country; and that is the only purpose of this provision in the bill, according to the theory of its proponents. While that is true, while it will not raise the price of live stock in this country, undoubtedly the result of the duty, as would be the result of the imposition of any other duty under similar circumstances, will furnish the producers of meat products in this country, whether those products are in the hands of private parties or in the hands of a trust, an excuse for raising the domestic price to the consumer to the amount of the duty.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If I caught the figures which were given by the Senator from North Carolina aright, the total consumption of this country—that is to say, our production together with the imports—amounts to about 25,000,000,000 pounds.

Mr. SIMMONS. It amounts to 24,884,000,000 pounds.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. For the purpose of calculation we will say 25,000,000,000 pounds. If the imposition of the duty should result in an increase of 2 cents a pound, the aggregate increase, as I figure it, would be \$500,000,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think the Senator from Montana is correct.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is what this proposed legislation signifies to the people of the United States. It is proposed to pay a subsidy to the packers of meats in this country amounting to \$500,000,000, in the expectation that they will distribute some of it to the producers of live stock.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; and with the certainty that they will not distribute any of it, but will put it in their own pockets and continue to press down the price of the live stock which they buy.

Mr. President, in this country, unfortunately for us, the meat industry is in the hands of the great packers, who cooperate to a common purpose—pressing down the price of what they buy and pressing up the price of the things they sell. They fix the price at which meat is sold to the people as high as they please, and they always fix it as high as the traffic will bear. However, the trust has to have some regard to public sentiment, and they are always making excuses for increasing the prices of their products. They are always, on the other hand, seeking excuses to reduce the prices of their raw material; that is, the prices of live stock in this instance. While the tariff duty will not be operative to accomplish the purpose claimed by its proponents, it will undoubtedly furnish the packers, in the first instance, an excuse, and a very plausible one, and one calculated to deceive the public, for raising the price of their products 2 cents a pound.

If it stopped there it would be bad enough; but it will not stop there. Not only the packers will use that as an excuse to increase their price, but when the product reaches the wholesaler he will use the duty as an excuse to still further increase the price he will exact; and when it reaches the retailer, he will use it as an excuse for increasing the price he will charge the ultimate consumer.

Mr. POMERENE. And they always do so.

Mr. SIMMONS. They always do it. We have had a pretty good illustration of that with reference to the excess-profits tax. During the war everybody knows that many of the manu-

facturers of the country not only used the excess-profits tax for the purpose of increasing their prices to the extent of the tax, but they also used it for the purpose of increasing their prices far beyond the amount of the tax, thereby imposing upon the people, at the same time they provided for the Government tax, a tax for their own benefit.

Then we know as the product went on to the wholesaler and finally to the retailer they again added to the price because of these war taxes. We do not know to what extent the excess-profits tax was duplicated in whole or part, but we do know it was one of the excuses and grounds upon which prices were pyramided. We know that it was added and more than added by the manufacturer in many instances, and we know that it was used in turn as a pretext for advancing the prices charged by the wholesalers and by the retailers. This proposed tax on meat will be used in the same way that the excess-profits tax has been used.

That is the fundamental vice, Mr. President, of imposing a so-called protective tax upon a foreign product that will not be operative to accomplish such purpose, either because there are but slight importations or because the domestic price on account of overproduction is on an export basis; but, notwithstanding, will furnish an excuse for unscrupulous dealers to advance the price to the consumer.

Such a tax on a raw material of which there is none, or but a relatively small amount, will be inoperative as to such material; but if there is a compensatory duty to the domestic manufacturer it will be added, and if none it will be used as a pretense to increase the price of the finished article.

An illustration of that is found in the cotton tax imposed by this bill. It is proposed to impose a tax upon long-staple cotton. As originally proposed, it could not affect one way or the other more than 60,000 bales of cotton in this country known as American Egyptian cotton, but because the bill puts a tax of 8 cents a pound upon Egyptian cotton under the Republican theory it is necessary to place a compensatory tax upon the imports of cotton goods into this country to the extent of 7 cents on every article of which the component material of chief value is Egyptian cotton.

That duty will not help anybody in this country except possibly the producers of this American type of Egyptian long-staple cotton; but it will enable the manufacturers of this country to demand that every pound of cotton goods that comes here from Great Britain shall be closely examined and if it contains as its component material of chief value Egyptian cotton that it shall pay a duty of 7 cents a pound. Practically all the cotton goods that come from Great Britain are what are known as high grades or counts. Our mills make the coarser grade and use almost entirely short-staple cotton—and nearly all the American crop is short staple. Egypt raises about 1,500,000 bales of this long-staple cotton. Great Britain could take and would be glad to take every pound of it, and it would not more than supply her demand for use in the manufacture of the finer goods which her mills produce—and sells in large quantities to us. She sends us scarcely any cotton goods; the component material of chief value is not Egyptian cotton. So, while this duty will be utterly inoperative to protect the cotton producers of this country, it will at the same time impose upon the consumers in this country of English cotton goods a duty of 7 cents a pound, and this will raise the price to the consumers of the cotton goods produced in this country up to the same level. Thus a futile duty imposed upon cotton, a duty that can not help the cotton growers of the country except the growers of a small quantity of long-staple cotton, chiefly in New Mexico and California, will furnish an excuse, and not only an excuse but the right, on the part of the cotton manufacturers of this country to raise their prices to the same level that the duty raises the price of cotton goods brought into this country and containing a certain proportion of this Egyptian staple.

So here is a duty intended to protect the producers of a few thousand bales of American cotton that will impose through this compensatory tax a heavy burden upon the users in this country of cotton cloths, whether of foreign or domestic production. I can not conceive of a more dangerous system of taxation than that; I can not conceive of a more reckless prostitution of the principle of protection.

Mr. President, I sincerely trust that we may be able after a while to get the country to understand—and I think we are getting the country to understand—what this bill means. Never in the history of this country or any other country has a great measure like this, affecting the people so vitally as this affects them, been prepared by a committee with such utter recklessness and disregard of the ultimate effects of the proposed action upon the people. In the committee all that was necessary to

secure the adoption of an amendment was to tell a little story about the deplorable condition of this industry or that industry, to show the distressful condition of the farmer raising this product or the other product. On such a showing the committee recklessly, practically without investigation, and without adequate information, ignoring the Tariff Board altogether, voted to impose the duties contained in this bill. I have no idea that the Republican members of the committee would have taken such action under ordinary circumstances, but the suggestion of an emergency and that the farmers of the country were here demanding relief of some sort was sufficient, and they fixed these duties generally at the rates suggested, so anxious were they to make fair weather with the farmer, to whose interest they heretofore paid such slight consideration. But that is another story.

Notwithstanding that, when this bill reaches the Senate and we expose its inequities, when we make it clear to every man of intelligence that the bill will not accomplish the purposes it is intended to accomplish, but may in many other directions do infinite harm to the country, they proceed to adopt, and they propose to continue to adopt, amendments with the same recklessness as they were placed in the bill. No argument that we can make will prevail with them; but, Mr. President, I think the country is beginning to understand. I have been hearing from my section of late. The farmers were at first somewhat misled. They thought that they might get some relief out of this bill, but as it is discussed here and they begin to understand how remote the prospects of any benefit to them are and what a tremendous burden, what a staggering burden it is going to impose upon them, they are, according to my information, changing their minds very materially about this matter.

I tell you right now that, in my judgment, this bill no more meets the approval of the intelligence on the other side than it does on this side. I do not state it as a fact, but I declare it as my belief, and that belief is not without foundation, that many of the Republican Members of this body would not vote for these amendments and would not support this bill if they expected it would ever become a law. They are gambling upon this measure not becoming a law—not that it will not pass this Chamber, but that it will not pass the White House. If it were not such a serious matter, if it did not impose upon the people of this country the grievous burdens to which I have referred, I would be glad to have it become a law in order that it might give a practical demonstration to the people of this country of the worthlessness of this measure to accomplish the purpose for which it is intended, and the reckless disregard of the rights of the people by the party in power when political consideration and interest are supposed to be involved.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Hedlin	McNary	Simmons
Brandegge	Henderson	Moses	Smoot
Capper	Hitchcock	Nelson	Spencer
Culberson	Johnson, Calif.	New	Stanley
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Sterling
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Page	Sutherland
Fletcher	Kenyon	Philpps	Thomas
Gay	Keyes	Pittman	Townsend
Gerry	Kirby	Pomerene	Trammell
Glass	Knox	Ransdell	Underwood
Gronna	Lenroot	Robinson	Walsh, Mont.
Harris	McKellar	Sheppard	Warren
Harrison	McLean	Shields	Wills

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] are absent on official business.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the absence of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], and the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] on business of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The question is on the amendment to subdivision 14.

Mr. HARRISON. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOX (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] and vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] and vote "yea."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT], who is absent. Being unable to secure a transfer, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH of Montana (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. In his absence, I transfer that pair to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a standing pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], who is unavoidably absent from the Chamber. I transfer that pair to the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GLASS (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and will let my vote stand.

Mr. LODGE. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON];

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH];

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT]; and

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN].

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] are necessarily detained on official business. If the Senator from Massachusetts were present, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—39.

Ball	Johnson, Calif.	McLean	Sheppard
Borah	Jones, N. Mex.	McNary	Smoot
Brandeggee	Jones, Wash.	Myers	Spencer
Capper	Kellogg	Nelson	Sterling
Curtis	Kenyon	New	Sutherland
Elkins	Knox	Page	Townsend
Fall	La Follette	Phipps	Wadsworth
Gay	Lenroot	Pittman	Warren
Gronna	McCormick	Poindexter	Willis
Henderson	McCumber	Ransdell	

NAYS—26.

Beckham	Harrison	Overman	Swanson
Culberson	Heflin	Pomerene	Thomas
Dial	Hitchcock	Reed	Underwood
Fletcher	Keyes	Robinson	Walsh, Mont.
Gerry	Kirby	Shields	Williams
Glass	McKellar	Simmons	
Harris	Moses	Stanley	

NOT VOTING—31.

Ashurst	France	Lodge	Smith, Ga.
Calder	Frelinghuysen	Newberry	Smith, Md.
Chamberlain	Gooding	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Colt	Gore	Owen	Trammell
Cummins	Hale	Penrose	Walsh, Mass.
Dillingham	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pheasant	Watson
Edge	Kendrick	Sherman	Wolcott
Fernald	Kling	Smith, Ariz.	

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I understand that we are not working under a unanimous-consent agreement as to committee amendments, and therefore, to complete this subject, I ask that subdivision 13 be stricken from the bill. It reads:

Fresh mutton and lamb, 2½ cents per pound.

Subdivision 14 covers "fresh or frozen beef, veal, mutton, lamb," and so forth. It is a repetition, and therefore subdivision 13 is not necessary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 3, strike out line 3, which reads:

13. Fresh mutton and lamb, 2½ cents per pound.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BORAH subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire to reserve for a separate vote in the Senate the amendment which

is now subdivision 13, I think, "fresh or frozen beef," and so forth.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The numerals will be changed, on line 4, striking out "14" and inserting "13."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 3, after the amendment just agreed to, to insert a new subdivision, to be numbered 14, and to read as follows:

14. That cattle and sheep and other stock imported for breeding purposes shall be admitted free of duty.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I desire to ask if the provision which has just been read is not the present law?

Mr. SMOOT. It is the present law, but this would be a provision in a law enacted subsequently to the present law. The pending bill imposes a duty upon live stock, and if we do not repeat the provision in this bill it is likely to be held that even cattle and sheep imported for breeding purposes shall be dutiable. To make it perfectly safe we put it in the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I see no objection to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, what disposition was made of subdivision 16, relating to cotton?

The VICE PRESIDENT. We have not yet reached that. The Secretary will state the next amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 3, line 10, strike out the numeral "14" and insert the numeral "15."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On line 10 strike out "three-eighths" and insert in lieu thereof "one-eighth," so that it will read:

15. Cotton having a staple of 1½ inches or more in length, 7 cents per pound.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, an amendment is pending which proposes to strike out "7 cents" and insert "30 cents." If agreed to it will, of course, impose 30 cents a pound upon all cotton of the kind described in the subdivision. Should it be defeated and the amendment of the committee agreed to, the rate will be 7 cents a pound.

It was stated by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] a few moments ago, if I understood him correctly, that this provision of the bill was due to the insistence of Arizona and California cotton growers and not of the cotton growers of the South.

Mr. SIMMONS. Not this amendment. The amendment was proposed, I understand, by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], who desires by it to bring within the provisions of the bill a large amount of cotton that otherwise would not be included.

Mr. THOMAS. The original item as reported by the House committee, and which limited the duty to cotton of the staple of 1½ inches, is changed by the committee amendment to include cotton having a staple of 1½ inches. I understood the Senator from North Carolina to make that statement, in substance.

Mr. SIMMONS. The original bill included only the Egyptian cotton, which is 1½ inches long. That cotton is grown in this country only in Arizona and California. If this change is made, the amendment having been offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], it will bring other than Egyptian cotton under the provisions of the bill. It will bring all cotton of the staple of 1½ inches under the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. I wanted to be sure that I understood the Senator before submitting some observations upon this item.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will say to the Senator that I think that would increase the amount from the 60,000 bales raised in California and Arizona up to about 300,000 bales.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I was very much interested in hearing the answer the Senator from North Carolina gave, but I have not heard a word. I heard the question, and I would like to know what the answer is.

Mr. THOMAS. I will repeat it for the Senator. It was due to an inquiry of mine, based upon what I understood to be the statement of the Senator a few moments ago.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think, if the Senator will pardon me, there is some upland cotton grown in several Southern States, in limited quantities, which probably would amount to something like 300,000 bales, which will be brought by this amendment within the protection of the bill. But it would not affect southern cotton except to the extent of that limited amount of cotton.

The importations to this country last year were more than 300,000 bales, but that was not all cotton of this staple length.

That included Mexican cotton, it included Indian cotton, and it included a number of cottons from other sections of the earth, but practically all of it of shorter staple than 1½ inches.

Mr. THOMAS. Replying to the Senator from Michigan, I understand this to be the genesis of the item: The House committee inserted this provision at the instance of the Arizona and California cotton growers, who produce all of the so-called American-Egyptian staple cotton raised in the United States, and it was confined to cotton which has a staple of 1½ inches. Thus drawn, it would apply to somewhere in the neighborhood of 60,000 bales of cotton; that is, it would operate, if good for anything, to protect that proportion of the cotton crop of the country.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] proposed an amendment to the Senate committee to strike out "three-eighths" and insert "one-eighth," thus making the provision embrace all cotton having a staple of 1½ inches or more, and leaving the duty at 7 cents a pound. Doubtless in the interest of Arizona and California cotton growers the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] proposed to substitute 30 cents for 7 cents, as reported by the committee.

Mr. President, the cotton industry in Arizona and the Imperial Valley in California is a comparatively recent one. It is largely the work of the Agricultural Department, which began experiments in cotton raising in those arid regions some 9 or 10 years ago. The soil and climate, where irrigation is available, are in certain sections of Arizona, and I think throughout the Imperial Valley and probably in some other portions of California, very favorable to the growth of cotton, and particularly of this long-staple cotton, which has therefore become a very substantial item of the industries of that region.

The long staple 1½-inch cotton is, of course, the most prominent feature of the cotton industry in that section, although by no means confined to it. Last year I think the production was about 60,000 bales of Egyptian cotton and about 140,000 bales of other staples, not so valuable, but first-class cotton of the grade, making the total somewhere in the neighborhood of 200,000 bales.

The only justification, the only possible excuse for the imposition of a 7-cent duty upon cotton would be that it was an infant industry needing protection until its development made it self-sustaining, but that is neither the basis of nor the reason for the imposition of the duty. The contention is that its present price, far below the cost of production, is due to the temporary surplus here of Egyptian cotton of the same grade, and that unless practically an embargo shall be placed upon importations of Egyptian cotton the Arizona grower is ruined. Although he may resort to the raising of oranges, citrus fruits, alfalfa, sugar beets, and the other products which characterized that section prior to the invasion of the cotton craze, that fact is not even reverted to.

It was found shortly after the outbreak of the war that the demand for this long-staple cotton made its production prospectively the most profitable crop that could be raised there, and one year's experience demonstrated the correctness of that forecast. As a consequence the landowners of that section, some of the great manufacturers of rubber goods, particularly automobile tires, and those possessed of a speculative instinct, all availed themselves of the situation and began the cultivation in large quantity—I have reference to acreage—of the long-staple cotton in Arizona and the Imperial Valley. The area of cultivation is limited by the amount of available water, which means that segregated localities, circumscribed by the water duty, measure the extent of production, whatever Federal legislation may be.

In many instances orchards, nurtured with the utmost care and at great expense, dependable for substantial and valuable crops year after year, were rooted up and destroyed that the land might be devoted to cotton culture. In other instances ranches devoted to cattle breeding and the breeding of blooded stock of all kinds were disposed of that the lands might be used to grow cotton. The craze consequent upon the tremendous demand for this particular staple turned the heads of the people, as is frequently or always the case under similar conditions. And the value of land soared from \$100 and \$150 to \$500, \$600, and \$750 an acre.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And the value was given to it by taxation by the Federal Government for irrigation purposes.

Mr. THOMAS. One of my constituents in southwestern Colorado recently told me he heard of a live-stock ranch to be dismantled near Phoenix, Ariz. So he went there and bought numbers of blooded stock and got them at a bargain, brought them to Colorado, and transferred that part of the Arizona industry to my State. He informed me that the prices then prevailing for land to be devoted to cotton culture had passed

all reason. Purchasers were competing with each other, bidding against each other what seemed to be fabulous prices, all to get land regardless of price for cotton planting. I am informed by good authority that the crop of 1919 brought such tremendous prices that purchasers of lands were able to pay for them from the profits of that year's crop.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what was the current price in 1919?

Mr. THOMAS. I can not give it to the Senator offhand. I have it in a report among the papers on my desk.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think it was about \$1 a pound.

Mr. THOMAS. The price for the long-staple cotton?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I remember that the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] said, in the course of some remarks he made a few days ago, perhaps yesterday, that it cost 60 cents a pound to produce it, so there was a reasonable profit for that year.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not know what it cost to produce it, nor do I think that the producers under the circumstances then prevailing cared much about that subject.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The market price for long-staple cotton for that year, I understand, ran from 85 cents to \$1.15 a pound, with possibly a few sales at \$1.25. That resulted, as the Senator from Colorado has well said, largely in everybody going into the business, like they went into the tobacco business at certain times in limited tobacco districts in Kentucky. They went into this in that particular district on account of the peculiar nature of the plant and the enormous quantity and the quality of its production.

But it has resulted in a condition, if I may be permitted to interrupt the Senator further, that many there are on the verge of absolute bankruptcy. I do not like a 6 cents per pound duty on that cotton. I do not see any material benefit in 6 cents a pound on long-staple cotton against the Egyptian cotton, when the difference in the price of long-staple cotton and the ordinary cotton of commerce is three or four times as much and sometimes five or six times as much. If 6 cents were added to the present price of that commodity, it would not yet bring it up nearly to the cost of production.

Instead of any assumed protection in this bill, I would vote directly, there being so short a time and so many of the particular people whom I have tried to represent being involved, for an absolute embargo. I shall move to amend the bill in that respect before we are through, so we may see whether or not we can prevent the introduction into this country for the next 10 months of that long-staple cotton.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator from Montana asked what was the cost of the production of this cotton. I answered that I do not know, but I do know this—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. My inquiry was with reference to the current sales price.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator said something about the cost being 60 cents.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I merely quoted the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. THOMAS. That is the subject to which I have reference. I understood the Senator gave that as his own information.

I do know that the available labor there is largely Mexican and Indian; and, while it commands a higher price than the Negro labor of the South and the labor in Egypt, it is nevertheless the cheapest labor in the Southwest, particularly the Indian labor. It is a combination of that relative cheap labor plus what seemed the insatiable and unsatisfiable demand for that particular grade of cotton, which caused the people there to abandon their legitimate production and to rush pell-mell into the production of this long-staple cotton.

I may be mistaken. I do not pretend to speak from actual knowledge, and I rely upon secondhand information when I say that the original investment, high as it was, has been realized by the cotton growers, or most of them, upon one crop, or certainly not more than two. This year their production is far in excess of the preceding year. The prospects, I presume, at the time the crop was planted indicated another golden year, but unfortunately this period of depression has come over the world and paralyzed consumption. The Arizona cotton planters and the California cotton planters, in common with all others, find themselves confronted, as the Senator from Arizona says, with bankruptcy.

Hence they rush to the American Congress and implore it to place a virtually prohibitory duty upon the competing product, that they may shift their losses to the backs of the American consumers.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado pardon an interruption for a moment?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If I have understood correctly, he is quoting the junior Senator from Arizona as saying that the cost of the production of the cotton referred to was 60 cents a pound?

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator from Montana made the statement that the junior Senator from Arizona had informed the Senate a day or two ago that the cost of the production of this cotton was 60 cents a pound.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If that be true, and if the growers of that cotton produce 300 pounds per acre, which would be about three-fifths of what the Yazoo delta in Mississippi produces, that would be a protection of \$180 an acre per annum.

Mr. THOMAS. Why should it not be if that amount of protection is necessary to shift the loss confronting those gentlemen from their own to the backs of other people? It is perfectly legitimate if this bill is legitimate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course; but I was merely illustrating the fact that when it is desired to give a man who is farming a protection of \$180 an acre when he owns, let us say 30 acres or something like that, it is pretty nearly supporting him independently of his work.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; that would follow. I concede the necessity for the amendment of the Senator from Arizona, if it be the duty of the Congress to insure all producers against the vicissitudes of misfortune and adversity.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And against their own speculation.

Mr. THOMAS. And against their own speculation, for it was a speculation.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. Is it not a fact as to the long-staple cotton, as it was to the remainder of the cotton of the South, that its producers held it for higher prices at a time of declining prices?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not know as to that, and not knowing I do not care to express myself upon it. It is the natural tendency, however, with all of us to do so, if the prospect at all justifies it.

It is particularly true of those engaged in speculative production for producers to hold their commodities for a good market.

The Tariff Commission in its "Survey of the American raw-cotton industry," has this to say; I read from page 6 of its report:

Long-staple cottons are essential for two purposes: The production of fine counts and the production of yarns of any count where strength and superior wearing qualities are necessary. Of the long-staple cottons that measure over $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches in length, Egypt is the only large source, having a crop that averages around one and a quarter million bales. England is the main producer of fine yarns, and for a good many years English fine spinners have been searching in vain for a new source of supply, as the demand for long-staple cotton has been exceeding the supply. In recent years the sudden upgrowth of the tire-fabric industry, particularly in the United States, has rendered the situation much more acute by using increasing amounts of long-staple cotton in the production of coarse counts.

Mr. President, I have statistics somewhere of the condition of the rubber industry. I recall, among other items, one showing that the price of rubber has fallen from about 35 to 19 cents a pound, and as a result the rubber industry of the United States has become paralyzed. The great manufacturers of tires in the city of Akron, that being the principal industry of that great community, have been so badly stricken by the depression that I am told the population of that city is scarcely 60 per cent of what the census gave it last year; while the companies themselves, to use the expression of my friend from Arizona, "are confronted with bankruptcy." They can not buy any more of this cotton of which they are the principal consumers. Now, what would be said of those great rubber manufacturing companies if they should come to Congress and ask it to pass a law enabling them to transfer their losses from themselves to the people at large?

Mr. WILLIAMS. They will do so in the next Congress.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not know why they should not, if that be our legislative duty.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. If the Senator will permit me, in view of the fact that he has referred to the rubber industry, I desire to say that nearly all of those plants are running at, perhaps, about 25 per cent capacity. I know that one of the plants that usually employs about 30,000 men, a few weeks ago only had in its employ about 7,000 men, so that there are now 23,000 men who are out of work. Certainly we ought to do something to guarantee them their wages as well while we are passing this proposed legislation.

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly, if the wave now sweeping over the country is to wash this great Nation upon the shores of pater-

nalism, we have no right whatever to limit our governmental operations to a few of its chosen people. It is idle to say that the producers shall be guaranteed against all loss, while those who are unemployed because of depressed conditions and the consumers generally shall be outside the pale of such governmental solicitude.

Mr. POMERENE. I should add, also, that we have just taken care of the people who are out of employment by adding 2 cents a pound to the price of the meat which they eat.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; they must pay 2 cents a pound more for meat; 40 cents a bushel more for wheat; and before we get through with the bill all the necessities of life will be similarly overburdened.

The tire industry when in operation is a great consumer of and therefore a great customer for long-staple cotton. Should we adopt this amendment it must have a compensatory duty of 30 cents a pound to enable it to compete with the foreign manufacturers of tires, who will get the Egyptian cotton free of duty. There are said to be six or seven million automobiles in the United States, each of which requires four tires. I leave it to others to calculate the added cost to the public patronizing that one industry consequent upon the effort to guarantee the product of less than 50,000 people in the States of Arizona and California. Resuming the reading of the report:

In Commerce Reports of February 20, 1920, there are set forth the results of an investigation by the British cotton-growing committee which shows that while the world is dependent on the United States for its supplies of ordinary cotton, supplemented by coarser grades from India and China, Egypt still remains the only large source of the long-staple cottons needed by English fine-yarn mills.

Mr. President, we imported last year—we had to do it; our manufacturers were obliged to do so because they could not get the supply elsewhere—some 690,000 bales of foreign cotton.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator must remember that the Egyptian bale of cotton does not weigh as much as the American bale; it only weighs about half as much.

Mr. THOMAS. I did not know that. What is the weight?

Mr. WILLIAMS. A bale of cotton in the South weighs 500 pounds, while the Egyptian bale weighs 250 pounds, I think. I will ask the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. Perhaps the weight of the Egyptian bale is 125 pounds?

Mr. FLETCHER. It is, I think, 400 pounds.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think it is 250 pounds.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I interrupt the Senator from Colorado to say that the statistics are based on pounds; and the number imported during the 11 months ending November, 1920, was 287,040,596 pounds, valued at \$134,986,447.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Senator. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL], however, some time ago, made the statement upon the floor that the importations of cotton last year were 690,000 bales, as I remember.

Mr. RANDELL. Yes, sir; and I have in my hand a letter from Mr. Henry G. Hester, secretary of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange, who is recognized as the best cotton statistician in the world, in which he says:

Last year there were imported 700,000 bales: Egyptian, 485,000; Chinese, 57,000; Peruvian, 64,000; Indian, 14,000; Mexican, 65,000; and all others, 15,000; a total of 700,000.

He makes the total 10,000 more bales than the figures given by me. As I desire to be entirely fair, I will say that Mr. Hester further states:

This total compares with 201,000 bales for the 12 months ended July 31, 1919, and 221,000 bales for the corresponding period in 1918.

Which shows that there was a great deal more than the average imported last year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does he give the weight of the Egyptian bales? The weight of the Peruvian bales is one thing and of the Egyptian another.

Mr. RANDELL. He does not state what the Egyptian bale weighs, but his figures are stated in the equivalent of 500-pound bales.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Egyptian bale is about half the weight of the American bale, I think.

Mr. THOMAS. According to the statement of the Senator from Louisiana more than one-half of the importations for last year were from Egypt.

Mr. RANDELL. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, taking even figures and assuming that 400,000 bales of the Egyptian cotton were needed by American manufacturers for their fabrics, and then assuming that they will need as much more next year, if we impose upon that commodity a duty of 30 cents a pound, which at 500 pounds to the bale would amount to \$150 a bale, and which, of course, would be figured in the overhead expenses of the manufacturer, what will the price of cotton goods be to the American consumer next year? Shall we impose such a duty or any duty because the Arizona and California cotton growers miscalculated the mar-

ket, because in a business gamble they lost instead of won? Mr. President, if the Congress has reached that low degree in its deliberations as a legislative body, then it would seem to have reached the level where its usefulness is no longer observable, for it has become an agency for increasing the burdens of 105,000,000 consumers upon the pretense that some needy industries would otherwise be destroyed or disappear.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. THOMAS. I will yield in a moment. I quote further, as follows:

The import of Egyptian cotton during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, was more than double the normal. With the subsequent decline in domestic prices and curtailment of mill consumption the stock on hand of Egyptian cotton has become so much in excess of requirements as temporarily to stop imports. During the month of October, 1920, the import of Egyptian cotton amounted to only 3,675 pounds, equivalent to 7 bales of 500 pounds each.

I now yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. From the best information I can obtain from the colloquy on the floor, there were 480,000 bales of long-staple Egyptian cotton imported into the United States in the period referred to. Does the Senator from Colorado know how much Great Britain made on the exchange between the countries in getting that cotton from Egypt and putting it on our market, and does he know how much of that cotton is still held as a menace to the sale of what may now be in the cotton fields in this country?

Mr. THOMAS. No; I do not; and, with all due respect to the Senator, I do not care what it made. The cotton commanded the prevailing price at the time and no more.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That is what I thought was the matter with the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. That may be, but it is a matter of indifference to me what Great Britain made or whether she made anything. She is suffering quite as acutely as we are and from the same causes.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Is it also a matter of indifference to the Senator what Americans are losing?

Mr. THOMAS. Not at all. I am too deeply concerned about it to deceive the unfortunate by pretending that this bill will relieve them. But, as regards the bill, it is a matter of total indifference to me what profit Cuba is making on her American imports or what France or other countries are making. I hope they are making something, because if not, they will become more and more our debtors and may become objects of our charity.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. But the course being pursued by the Senator from Colorado would make us not only assume our own debts but pay theirs.

Mr. THOMAS. Not at all.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The Senator is willing that other countries shall make money out of this product, but he will not listen to the suggestion of our saving a cent.

Mr. THOMAS. Not at all, Mr. President. The Senator's inferences are obviously misleading. The one argument, aside from the unfounded assertion that these industries are facing destruction, is that some other country is making money out of America. Well, what is international trade for and how long will it endure if it does not give opportunities for mutual profit? How will you continue international trade if all countries engaged in it are losing all the time and the other is making all the time? How shall we retain markets to sell our goods in if we destroy the market for the goods which others sell us in exchange therefor?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Will the Senator permit one more interruption? Then I will not bother him further.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator is not bothering me at all. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The Senator misconceives the object of my question.

Mr. THOMAS. I am sorry if I do.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The Senator arrives at a false conclusion from the premises that I have at least in my own mind, whether I clearly express them or not.

Mr. THOMAS. That is highly probable. I am not infallible.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I was complaining that we had not so much a right to complain of what Great Britain happened to make on a trade, but how much of this trade made through Great Britain was a burden on our people at home, and permitting her, through her trade with Egypt, to buy long-staple cotton at reduced prices and send it to the cotton market of America to be held, as it is held to-day, as a menace against not only the long-staple cotton but all the balance of the cotton.

The Senator is no more liberal a free-trader, if you please, than I am in every particular, and for that reason I hate to see this matter become confused with the question of protection. There is no protection in 6 cents a pound. All this is a fraud, in my opinion.

This proposal to help people by making other people pay for it temporarily is not any remedy at all for present conditions. I am for an absolute, straight-out, square prohibition against the importation of long-staple cotton during the life of this bill, and until we have a chance to unload the great crop that is now unpicked in the field. Twenty-five cents a pound less than it has cost to make it is the best price that is offered to the people who have raised that cotton; and, as the Senator has well said, almost the front yards of those people have been put into cotton.

That, however, does not touch the question. Every man works for a living, and for what profit he can make. Suppose they did overplay. It was a question of their holding that cotton for a fair sale against an unfair sale through England that England might gain the profit, and the profit also to those men in America who were able to hold the cotton against the sale until the present crop was not worth picking. That was my only complaint; and I am not asking that this country pay anything when I say, "Do not let it come in at all." If they do not need ours, they will not buy it. If they do need it, they will.

That is the position I take in the matter. I am not for any of this alleged protection in any shape. I never was; I never will be; and my protest against this bill is that it is a fraud, under the guise of a beautiful protection, to do nobody any good, as New England will see very plainly as soon as this bill passes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have the highest respect for Republicans who are protectionists and make no pretense about it. I always know where to find them. I do not want to offend anybody, certainly not friends who are as dear to me as every Member of the Senate on this side of the Chamber; but, with all due regard to their feelings, I must say that I can not respect the intellectual processes of a man who calls himself a Democrat and who supports a bill like this. No doubt they have the same opinion of myself; I do not know; but for God's sake let us be fish, flesh, or fowl. Let us be either for this bill or against it. Let us accept the Republican theory of prohibitive protection or repudiate it, as we always have heretofore, whether some local interest is involved or not.

The great trouble with the Democratic Party is that during its long exile, and frequently while in power, when face to face with its duty, it has failed to measure up to its principles and its duty. I think that is one reason why we were so miserably defeated at the last election. If we had made our campaign upon undoubted Democratic principles and sloughed off many new doctrines, both international and domestic, although we might have lost the election, I am confident the minority on this side of the Chamber would have been somewhat more respectable in numbers than it will be in the next Congress.

I do not regard the importation of Egyptian cotton into the United States as imposing any burden upon the people. We bought it because we had to have it, and the reason why there is an excess now is the same reason for an excess of everything else in this country—the utter collapse of the purchasing side of the market; the fundamental and inexorable operation of the law of supply and demand, which even this Congress, in the plenitude of its power, can not repeal, although it has tried to do so a number of times.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. STANLEY. Is it the contention of the advocates of a duty upon long-staple cotton that under normal conditions the cost of production of that cotton in the Imperial Valley in Arizona is greater than the price of the imported Egyptian cotton in the open market?

Mr. THOMAS. That is the contention at present; yes.

Mr. STANLEY. If that be the case, as I understand, the areas in which this cotton is raised are watered by the Roosevelt Dam and other great constructions built by the Government, and we have gone to hundreds of millions of dollars of expense to build them.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I deny that. They were not built by the Federal Government, because we are going to pay back every dollar spent for building them.

Mr. STANLEY. They were built by the Government.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. No; they were not built by the Government. They were built on a loan that we are paying off very rapidly.

Mr. STANLEY. I will say to my friend from Arizona that it is as broad as it is long, if we have to give them the money to pay it in the way of a 30-cent duty.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. But we have to pay it back.

Mr. STANLEY. If you levy this duty, that will be the case; but I started to say that the Government has retrieved this land for the purpose of enabling people to go into an admittedly unprofitable business at the cost of the consumers of long-staple cotton generally.

Mr. THOMAS. That may be, Mr. President. I will not now take issue with my friend. He may be right, but the question which he asks I do not think can be answered except by stating what the present contention upon the subject of cost may be.

I do not believe that the Egyptian cotton industry has been in existence in the Southwest long enough to enable anyone to determine what the cost of production is, because production costs, like all others, have since the commencement of this war been abnormal, and that industry covers the period of abnormality. I stated some time ago—the Senator may not have been in the Chamber—that the principal sources of the labor are the Indians and the Mexicans, who constitute there the cheapest form of labor.

Now, I sympathize with these people. I am sorry to see them lose money. I know they are in distress.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will excuse another interruption, it strikes me that this phase of the question is broader than its effect upon a few thousand bales of cotton.

Mr. THOMAS. I have so stated.

Mr. STANLEY. If the western lands are irrigated—and I am in favor of irrigation—at the initial cost of the Federal Government, it is done for the purpose of supplying a fertile area for the production of essential foodstuffs or other essentials. Now, if these artificially retrieved lands, made productive at the cost in the first place, at least, of the taxpayers—and but little of that money has ever been paid back—are again to be hothoused by a protective duty, the whole system fails, and we had better leave the barren waste than to have to support by taxation the people who go to it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This is a proposition to protect a man against the misapplication of his land to something he did not profitably grow.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; that and the abortive outcome of his judgment combined. I think the Senator's position is extremely plausible.

Of course, the fund from which this land was reclaimed is formed by the sale of public lands, although many attempts have been made to supplement it with appropriations. As the Senator from Arizona says, the settler upon these lands must over a period of years refund that amount to the Government; but, as the Senator from Kentucky says, if the Government is first to reclaim these lands artificially and is then to hothouse them by the imposition of a prohibitory tariff upon their products, and which will constitute an enormous burden upon their consumers, then perhaps it might have been just as well, from the standpoint of dollars and cents, that the enterprises of reclamation had never been started. I do not say they should not have been. I am glad they have been.

Mr. STANLEY. In this case, to illustrate, it is infinitely worse. You produce 64,000 bales, as I understand, and you import three or four times that much. You have been paying to the Arizona and California cotton producers not 30 cents a pound but \$1 a pound, because the consumer is going to pay the increased cost not only upon the Arizona and California product, which is a modicum, but upon all the long-staple cotton consumed.

Mr. THOMAS. So I contended a few moments ago.

I was about to say when interrupted that I am as heartily in sympathy as anyone can be with the man who suffers, who sees his plans dissolve and disappear, and who anticipates golden returns from his efforts and from his enterprise only to confront loss and misfortune. There is no question but that he is entitled to sympathy; but sympathy is one thing and the taxation of the people of the United States by these enormous duties for the recoupment of these misfortunes is quite another.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. DIAL. As I understand, it has been stated in debate that the farmers were guilty of speculation because they did not sell their cotton last fall. I think that is an unjust accusation.

Mr. THOMAS. I did not say so.

Mr. DIAL. I thought the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] said so, and the Senator from Colorado agreed with him.

Mr. THOMAS. I have not made that charge. I do say—and I do not think there is any question about it—that a great deal of the wool of the country, much of the cotton, and much

of the live stock was held for better prices. I do not regard that as criminal or as disreputable.

Mr. DIAL. The reason why they did not sell was that they could not get it out; they could not get it ginned; and if it had gone on the market it would have depressed the market more rapidly.

Mr. THOMAS. The statement has been made on this floor several times, and, as far as I know, it has not been questioned. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] told the committee that a good many of his constituents held back their live stock for the Chicago market to await a Republican victory; that is, until after the election. Their mental process probably was that a Republican victory was the equivalent of rising prices, and, as a consequence, they could safely rely upon that sequence of cause and effect and withhold their cattle. But, unfortunately, there again their judgment was misplaced.

Mr. DIAL. We knew they would soon repent of their action. Mr. THOMAS. And, as a consequence, they were not able to secure the prices which could have been secured had the normal course been followed and the cattle been sold earlier.

I do not complain of that. No man living who can afford to do so but will hold his stock of goods, whatever they may be, for better prices, if better prices are probable. That is good business judgment and common sense. But if he does miscalculate, and misfortune comes, why should I be compelled to make his loss good?

Mr. SIMMONS. I would like to say to the Senator from Colorado that I do not think there has ever been any question in this country about the American producer of long-staple cotton competing with the Egyptian producer. It does not make any difference whether the Egyptian cotton can be produced cheaper than our cotton or not, by reason of the fact that Egypt alone, of all the countries of the world, produces this long-staple cotton, but only produces about a million and a half bales of it, and Great Britain requires every pound of it, needing every pound of it in the manufacture of her high and costly cotton goods, which has raised the Egyptian product to a point which is sufficiently remunerative to attract the American grower of cotton. That cotton has always commanded a very high price in the market. It has always commanded a price that to Americans would be a very remunerative price. The slump in the price of long-staple cotton in this country has not been due to the importation of Egyptian cotton at all.

It has been due to other causes, and the evidence of that is contained in the fact that short-staple cotton in this country, against which there are no importations from any quarter of the globe to amount to a bagatelle, has slumped in price just about in proportion to the slump that has taken place in the price of long-staple cotton. The cause of that slump in the price of short-staple cotton was not importations, neither is the cause of the slump in the price of long-staple cotton importations. Both have slumped, and both have slumped from the same cause. If the slump in long staple was the result of importations, and that was the only reason operating in fixing the price of cotton in this country, and the only cause of the slump of cotton in this country, then the short-staple cotton would not have slumped; but, as a matter of fact, they have both slumped, and slumped about in the same proportion.

Mr. THOMAS. That is undoubtedly true, Mr. President, and it is equally true of all the productions of man, with the exception of bootleg whisky and postage stamps.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the difference in the situation between the short staple white cotton that we produce and long-staple cotton is that no country in the world can produce this character of short-staple white cotton, whereas Egypt and two or three other countries can and do produce a long-staple cotton. I can not agree with my good friend, the Senator from North Carolina, regarding the presence of long-staple cotton. I am sure that the coming of this long-staple cotton into the markets of the United States does depress the price of our long-staple cotton. Its presence in the United States to-day affects that market injuriously. I am opposed to the dumping of this kind of cotton upon the American markets.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, there is no dumping of long-staple cotton in the United States; absolutely none. There is no dumping of the long-staple cotton in the United States or in any other country. Anybody who knows anything about the business—and I know very little—will say, and support it by the statistics, that the supply of the long-staple product is to-day insufficient to meet the demand. What is called the dumping of this cotton upon our market is due to the fact that we have an unusual supply at the present time because of the depression in business and in manufacturing.

Mr. HEFLIN. Some Senator has said that we have on hand quite a supply of long-staple cotton.

Mr. THOMAS. We have.

Mr. HEFLIN. If we have quite a supply, more than we need, and the bulk of it brought in from foreign countries, does not the Senator think that that is dumping it upon the markets of America?

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator's premise were correct, his conclusion would be unavoidable. But, Mr. President, the surplus of which he complains is due to the closing of our mills at the present time, and they were not closed because we have too much cotton; they were closed because they could not sell their goods.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Does the Senator contend that our mills use Egyptian cotton?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Where?

Mr. THOMAS. They use it in manufacturing the products of rubber.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. But where do they use it on the looms?

Mr. THOMAS. It is used to a certain degree.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. It does not come in competition with American cotton at all.

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly it does. Long-staple cotton is long-staple cotton, I do not care where it comes from.

Mr. HEFLIN. I would like to have the Senator tell me of a single cotton mill in the United States using this long-staple cotton which has closed its doors and ceased to operate.

Mr. THOMAS. Many of them have closed down and many others have decreased their forces, and they are running, as compared with their full force, a very small one. If the Senator, however, will extend his question so as to take in the great tire manufacturers of the country, then I refer him to the statement made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] just a few minutes ago.

The dumping of goods upon a country, Mr. President, is a practice which is familiar to many, perhaps to all. It is entirely distinct from the importation of raw material that is indispensable to domestic manufacturers, and because the industry is confronted with a period of depression in consequence of which it is unable to function normally. Then, while it will have for the time being a surplus of raw material upon its hands, to call that dumping is contrary to all my notions of what the term implies and of the practices for which it is used.

But, Mr. President, I did not intend to take the afternoon in the discussion of this matter. Before I take my seat, however, I want to read into the RECORD an extract from an article in the American Review of Reviews for February entitled "What makes the far West grow." I read from page 184.

The middle West has not added an important new product to its list of staple crops for 30 years, since alfalfa was introduced. The far West in the past decade added two economically most important staples to its agricultural output. In 1910 the Pacific coast produced not a pound of rice; in 1920 California's rice crop amounted to 3,000,000 sacks of 100 pounds each, grown on stiff clay land considered almost worthless 10 years ago. But even more important an achievement of the Department of Agriculture is the successful development of a high-class long-staple Egyptian cotton variety adapted to the conditions prevailing in the valleys of the Southwest.

Let me now emphasize the next sentence:

In spite of the present depression the fact remains that the world is short of cotton.

In my judgment, there is no question about the truth of this assertion.

Long before the war British textile interests were determinedly trying to establish new cotton-producing centers in many parts of the British colonial empire, but without great success. Now the Southwest has demonstrated that it can produce in competition with Egypt long-staple cotton ideally suited for the manufacture of tire fabric and airplane cloth in quantities sufficient eventually to supply all American needs. A decade ago the cotton industry in the Imperial Valley of California, in the Yuma and Salt River Valleys of Arizona, was just beginning. In 1920 the output of long-staple cotton alone reached more than 100,000 bales. The growth of Phoenix, Ariz., from 11,134 in 1910 to 29,053 inhabitants in 1920 is in large part due to the stimulus of long-staple cotton profits.

Yet in the writer's judgment too rapid a growth in the rice and cotton output is not an unmixt blessing for the West. The factor that is the backbone of the agricultural West, that will make continued growth of the agricultural population and output possible for a century to come, is the small irrigated farm intensively cultivated by the owner with a minimum of hired labor.

A truer statement, Mr. President, never fell from the lips of man.

That type of farm has transformed the semiarid wastes of southern California, of the Yakima and Wenatchee Valleys in Washington, of the Snake River and Payette Valleys in Idaho, of the Grand River Valley in Colorado, into the most productive, the most densely populated rural regions in the country. Long-staple cotton, if grown in small patches and rotated properly with alfalfa and other diversified products, is a most desirable new cash crop in the Southwest, but if it is grown on large plantations with armies of hired labor, or if it brings in its train the tenant system of the South, it will injure rather than advance the cause of intensive farming in the far West.

The consequences here outlined have already made themselves felt in the Salt River Valley of Arizona, in the Imperial Valley of California.

Short-staple cotton at 40 cents, long-staple American-Egyptian cotton at a dollar a pound, proved too strong a lure to resist. In 1920 the acreage more than doubled as compared with 1919; thousands of acres of alfalfa were plowed up; the live-stock and dairy industries were relegated to the background for the sake of prospective cotton fortunes.

In other words, fields producing alfalfa in that magnificent climate, four or five or six crops a year, were plowed up and relegated to the background to make room for cotton.

From 116,000 bales in 1919 the California-Arizona output rose to 260,000 bales in 1920, but the profits did not materialize.

This year the cotton area of the far Southwest will be cut in half. 'Tis better thus. If southern farming methods constitute the price the West has to pay for the new crop, it would be better to import a triple-strength weevil to eradicate every boll. But the lesson has been learned, and rational cotton progress is to be expected.

Mr. President, I know, of course, that this amendment is doomed to passage, not the amendment of my friend the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], but the amendment fixing the rate at 7 cents. I know, as stated by the senior Senator from Arizona, that it will be productive of no benefit whatever, because if it is to amount to anything it must be prohibitory, and it can not be prohibitory at less than 30 cents a pound. If the Congress in its wisdom shall determine that the importation into this country of a needed raw material is to be practically prohibited, or penalized at a price per pound sufficiently high to produce or tend to produce a price for the American product which is the equivalent of 90 or 95 cents or a dollar a pound, or any price over and above the cost of production, well and good; but will the party or the interest which becomes responsible for that sort of legislation be permitted to remain long in power in this country?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, is it in order to offer an amendment, with a view to having it pending, to this paragraph?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is in order to offer an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. It is an amendment that I propose, and that I would like to have read and printed in the RECORD, to be called up at the proper time. It is an amendment to this subdivision and not an amendment to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 3, at the end of line 11, the Senator from Arizona moves to amend by inserting:

Cotton having a staple of 1½ inches or more in length shall not be admitted into the United States from any foreign country during the 10 months succeeding the enactment of this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will lie on the table.

ADDRESS BY GOV. JOHN M. PARKER, OF LOUISIANA.

Mr. GAY. Mr. President, I ask consent of the Senate to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the governor of Louisiana, John M. Parker, before the Southern Tariff Congress, held in Atlanta, Ga., on January 27, 1921.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

[Address by Gov. John M. Parker, of Louisiana, before Southern Tariff Congress, held in Atlanta, Ga., Jan. 27, 1921.]

"ATLANTA, GA., January 27.

"The preparation of a protective tariff on agricultural products, more particularly a tariff differing with the various countries with which the United States deals, commensurate with the relative difference in the cost of labor and the amount of wages and standard of living in each of these various countries, was the principal recommendation urged for immediate enactment before the Southern Tariff Congress here by Gov. John M. Parker, of Louisiana, to-day. Gov. Parker also stressed the necessity of the rigid exclusion from this country of undesirable immigrants.

"One of the principal features of the address of the Louisiana executive was the point he made in declaring that America had permitted manufacturers to build up vast fortunes through protective tariffs on manufactured products, and that now it was time to save the farmers from ruin by placing a protective tariff on agricultural products to keep the strong, clean, vigorous, and self-respecting American workingman from coming into competition with foreign pauper labor."

Gov. Parker said:

"To-day there is no class of people in the world more disheartened, discontented, and unsettled than those who, by their own efforts, produce the essentials to feed and clothe the world. Under the spur and impetus of Government appeals and their natural patriotism, they not only subscribed to Liberty bonds, which many have been forced to sell at a heavy discount, but went the limit in the production of foodstuffs of all kinds and of live stock.

"FARMER FACES RUIN."

"America stands as the richest Nation on the face of the globe, with granaries full to overflowing of products raised under the most expensive conditions ever known, and the American farmer, representing the real lifeblood of America, faces ruin due to the fact that he is in direct competition with the underfed, underpaid, and ignorant agricultural labor of the balance of the world.

"For many years, under the plea of 'infant industry,' an enormous protective tariff has been utilized to build up vast fortunes for the great manufacturing concerns of the East. Little or no heed has ever been paid to the farmer or laborer. The cry of the free breakfast table has been used as a slogan, and the importation often of the scum of Europe has been used as the club to drag down the American working man and woman. These conditions must not and shall not exist.

"It is little short of crime to compel the self-respecting American workman to come in competition with the labor of the driven moujiks of Russia, of the padrones of Italy, or of that class from central Europe who have been crushed by centuries of their toil and labor with no thought for the future and simply an effort to exist; and, for that reason, Congress at its next session should pass stringent laws against permitting this country to be the home of those who tear down, and many of whom never have, never will, and never can assimilate, American views or American ideals.

"Even more important is the proper protection of our agriculturists from that competition which they must face and which means bankruptcy unless a proper tariff protection shall be made against those countries whose mode of living, customs, and wages are so inferior to the American standard.

"COTTON MAN NEEDS HELP."

"It is unfair to the cotton producer to come in competition with the people of Korea and China, with their peanut oil and for their soy-bean oil prepared under most insanitary conditions to come into competition with our clean, wholesome cottonseed oil. And it is equally unfair for the producers of cotton to be on a parity basis with the producers in Egypt who represent the lowest class of labor and who have neither pride of ancestry nor thought of posterity, or to come in competition with the natives of India who live on a few cents a day and whose only garment is a breechcloth and turban.

"It is equally impossible for our rice producers to come into competition with the people of the Orient, whose needs are very limited, whose wages are the lowest known, and who live where men and women alike work like beasts of burden.

"Our sugar producers, representing both the beet sugars of the Central and Middle West, and the cane growers of the South, whose work was a blessing during the war when we would have gone without sugar but for their labor, are forced into competition with the people of South America and Cuba; and within the last few weeks I have seen trainload after trainload of Chinamen under contract coming in over the Southern Pacific, carried to Tampa, Fla., and transported to Cuba, where they will work under long-time contract at very low wages, and their product will be sent to this country to come into competition with and pauperize American citizens.

"Those magnificent farmers of the Middle West, who produce wheat, corn, and cattle on land wrested by their ancestors from the wilderness and land which now represents everything, both by intrinsic value and the tender memories and associations it brings to the descendants of those pioneers, can not come into competition with products of the very low-priced lands of the Argentine and other sections whose wheat and corn, pork, beef, and mutton are forcing American manhood where they are absolutely unable to make interest on their investment.

"The vast forests of Central America, filled with hardwood and pine, will be a great competitor to our lumber interests just as soon as adequate transportation is furnished. The list is long, very long, and time will prevent going into details, but intelligent action must be taken, and promptly, if we are to avert the dangers sure to come otherwise.

"We should have an intelligent, nonpartisan committee to make a careful study of conditions of those countries with which we do business.

"We should see to it promptly that the undesirable pauper labor of Europe is not permitted to come to America in hordes and create dissatisfaction and certain trouble.

"No anarchist or bolshevist or any people of that type should be permitted to enter, under any conditions, no matter what position in life they may occupy.

"The country should, after careful study, prepare a tariff with those various countries commensurate with the relative difference in the cost of labor and the amount of wages and the method of living of each country, and power should be given

to change any such regulations as often as may be needed after a reasonable notice.

"Every effort should be made to improve agricultural conditions by the maximum in order to assure the farmer and his family that happiness and contentment which can only come when they are earning a living and putting aside something for the rainy day sure to come.

"LABOR AND CAPITAL."

"Labor and capital should be compelled to recognize the rights of each other, and some intelligent plan should be worked out by which, after capital receives a fair interest and the salaries of executives and others are paid, a fair distribution out of any surplus should be made to labor which would feel its best energy should be applied to business in which it had a direct personal interest.

"Men of vision and forethought should be willing to put aside personal ambition to be of real, practical service at this period.

"For nearly 150 years we have successfully confronted and handled every problem presented. America is to-day the wonder of the world for real accomplishments. We should work to maintain the high standard and ideals this Nation has established, and our slogan should be 'America for Americans,' and we should make an earnest appeal to thinking men: 'Devote your brain, time, and energy to bringing peace, contentment, and happiness to the hundred millions of our citizens by assuring them protection where protection is needed.'

MILITARY NOMINATIONS.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in open executive session, that there be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs the nominations for promotions in the Army from the grade of first lieutenant up to and including the grade of colonel.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think that ought to be agreed to, but I hope that when it is agreed to the Senator will allow me to ask for the reference to his committee of the nomination of a general in the Army who will go out of commission if his nomination is not referred.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I intended to ask that specifically.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Very well.

Mr. ROBINSON. Why will not the Senator have all of the nominations referred to his committee? The committee can take such action upon the nominations as it desires to take, or refrain from acting, but I do think that at least enough consideration should be shown to these nominations to give the committee an opportunity to pass upon them. The Senator from New York does not object, I take it, to all the nominations being referred to his committee?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have no suggestion that there would be objection to it, but there is no doubt that objection would be made, if I should include that in my request.

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask unanimous consent that all nominations for promotions in the Army be referred, as in open executive session, to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SMOOT. I object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made. Is there objection to referring to the Committee on Military Affairs the nominations from the grade of colonel down to and including that of first lieutenant, as requested by the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and the nominations are so referred.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I now ask unanimous consent, as in open executive session, that there be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs the nomination of Brig. Gen. Frank McIntyre to be Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs.

In making the request I have this very brief explanation to make. It so happens that when Gen. McIntyre was nominated and confirmed as Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, approximately eight years ago, it was necessary for him, under some peculiar twist in the law or his own situation at that time, to surrender his commission in the Army of the United States. Since that time he has not held a commission in the line or the Staff Corps proper of the Army. He has held a commission as brigadier general, Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs. If he should not be confirmed by March 4, he will be out of the Army entirely, a result which I think no Senator would desire to see brought about. It is for that reason that I make the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just a moment. I think I had a letter the other day, and I brought it to the attention of the Senator from New York, with reference to this particular case. Does the Senator remember whether it was the McIntyre case or not?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The case of Gen. Lord has been brought to my attention in addition to that of Gen. McIntyre. That is slightly different. There is no doubt whatever about the case of Gen. McIntyre. That is conceded by all authorities.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from New York submit to an inquiry?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. Is it the purpose of the majority to refuse to permit nominations for promotion to the rank of brigadier general and nominations for promotion to the rank of major general to be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not authorized to speak for the majority, but I have most definite information that several Senators will impose an objection to the confirmation of nominations for brigadier general and major general. In order to save time and to save a discussion of the matter and to go as far as we can by unanimous consent, I have confined my request to the nominations for the grade of first lieutenant and up to that of colonel.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I do not intend to make any objection to the request of the Senator from New York, but I would like to be informed whether the other nominations are to receive no consideration whatever. The point I am making is that, the nominations having been sent to the Senate, they should at least be referred to the committee and the committee be given an opportunity to consider them. I should like to direct my question to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I ask him if it is the policy of the majority to deny an opportunity to refer the remaining nominations to the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. LODGE. If we begin to refer nominations, they will all have to be referred.

Mr. ROBINSON. What is the objection?

Mr. LODGE. As far as we go is to take up, as the Senator from New York has proposed, as I understand, a certain number of military appointments, routine appointments to which there is no objection, and dispose of them as we did of the original appointments. There will be a very decided opposition to any attempt at this time, I think, to confirm majors general or brigadiers general. I have no personal hostility to anyone on the list.

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that the nominations should receive some consideration by the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. That would apply to every nomination and to every committee.

Mr. ROBINSON. The interest of the service would require that these nominations be referred to the appropriate committee and that the committee be given an opportunity to determine whether the military service of the United States would be detrimentally affected by the failure of the Senate to take any action upon them.

Mr. LODGE. I think that will be decided very soon. This is not the last Senate that is going to meet, I hope.

Mr. ROBINSON. I hope not.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, some of these brigadier generals and colonels are officers who have had magnificent service in France. Some of them served during the entire war and were decorated and honored, and they have earned and deserve the promotion. It seems to me to be entirely wrong, in view of their gallant service, not even to have their appointments referred to the committee. Some of these officers feel that the failure is to some extent more or less a reflection upon them.

It does seem to me that the appointments ought to be referred to the committee, both in the Army and the Navy. If there is any dispute or question about any of them, it ought not to be left to the suggestion of a single Senator that the nomination shall go over. In the case of an officer who has won his promotion by nearly two years' service in France, with all the privations and dangers involved, and who has acquitted himself honorably, it seems to me that when his promotion comes here it should be given at least the consideration suggested by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, this is the first time in the history of the Senate of the United States, so far as my information extends, that promotions in the Army have been deliberately made the football of politics. It is the first time in the history of the United States Senate, so far as I know, that officers who have distinguished themselves in the military service of the country have been denied the simple opportunity of having their right to promotion considered by this body.

If these nominations should be referred to the appropriate committee and the committee should find that there exist substantial reasons why they should be rejected and why action upon them should be deferred, then no Senator could complain if the

nominations should take that course. But it is a sad day for the military service of the United States and a sad day for the honor of the Senate of the United States when promotions in the Army are made the subject of political influence.

What harm can come to the Senate, what harm can come to the country, if the nominations are referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and considered by that committee? On the other hand, what harm will come to these nominees if they are denied any consideration whatever? We can not deny the conclusion that it is a reflection on every gallant soldier in the list to say that not only shall he not be confirmed, but that his nomination shall not be considered for confirmation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask the Senator if it is consistent with any principle about which he has information to refer to the committee promotions below the rank of colonel and refuse to refer to the same committee, which has a Republican majority, promotions above the rank of colonel?

Mr. ROBINSON. No, Mr. President, and that thought was the one which prompted me to make the suggestion that I made to the Senator from New York when he submitted his request for unanimous consent. The Senate will not honor itself and it will not render the country any service, it will not increase the efficiency of the military department, to say that these officers shall be denied a hearing and their names sent down to posterity with the humiliation and disgrace which must attach by reason of the action that is contemplated, denying them even a hearing before the Committee on Military Affairs.

It carries politics far enough to say that nominations for postmasters, who have been selected under the civil-service rules and regulations, shall not be considered. It is going too far for the honor of the military service and for the honor of the Senate of the United States and it is stooping too low.

Take the list of 11 men who have been promoted to the rank of major general—every one of them save two served on the battle front, and are men of distinction, renown, and courage. The same statement applies to the 22 who have been nominated for promotion to the grade of brigadier general.

On what theory, because of what policy, is politics deliberately injected into the Army of the United States? These nominations were not made through political influences. It may be that the list contains some names that ought to be rejected; but in fairness to the others the Senate ought to act. I shall not object to the request submitted by the Senator from New York, but I repeat my inquiry to him in another form, and I ask him to say whether he does not think that all these nominations should be referred to his committee and be considered by that committee? I should like the Senator from New York to answer that question. I have waited, Mr. President, for an answer.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I thought the Senator was going to continue his speech. I will say to the Senator very frankly that I have not the slightest objection to the nominations being referred to the committee.

Mr. ROBINSON. But that is not the question which I asked the Senator from New York. I did not ask the Senator if he objected to their reference. I ask him, as a Senator and as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, if he does not believe that all these nominations ought to be referred to and considered by his committee? If he says that he does not, I ask him to say why.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do.

Mr. ROBINSON. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, as the Senator from Arkansas has referred to me, I only desire to say that if all Army nominations are to be referred, similar action must be taken with reference to other nominations. No reflection whatever is intended against any man on the list, be he major general or brigadier general. I think, however, in connection with appointments to those important places it is very desirable, as a new administration is to be installed in a month, that it should have an opportunity to look the list over, though not for political reasons. I do not know the politics of a single man who has been nominated. Politics is never brought into any Army matter with me, but the country has not yet forgotten the politics that was used in preventing the service of Theodore Roosevelt in France, in keeping Leonard Wood at home, and in other instances that might be mentioned. There is no thought of politics in this matter; it does not make the slightest difference politically who picks the men out. There has, however, been more or less favoritism, and some injustice done, in my judgment, and I should like to have some one else at the head of the War Department have an opportunity to look over the selections which carry, and I am sure in almost all cases

justly carry, great honor and distinction. I think it is better that the nominations should go over. There is no discrimination meant against these officers. It is what happens as to all nominations irrespective of the committee entitled to consider them.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question in regard to naval appointments. I can understand that the chiefs of bureaus who may be appointed ought to be in accord with the incoming administration; I can appreciate why there should be objection to the confirmation of officers nominated to fill these positions; I know if I were Secretary of the Navy I would like to name my own chiefs of bureaus; but as to the other naval officers, their appointments have not been dictated even remotely by political considerations. The law fixes definitely how they shall be promoted. A board of selection passes on them; if they are found qualified they are put on an eligible list, and when put on that eligible list the officer whose name is highest is given precedence in making the appointment. The board of selection is composed entirely of naval officers.

I can understand, perhaps, how the Senator from Massachusetts might have some objection to confirming the nominations of general officers, for the simple reason that after the grade of colonel is passed it is left with the President to select those who shall be made brigadier generals and major generals; but in the Navy a different system prevails.

Mr. LODGE. Let me say to the Senator that there has been no decision reached about the naval appointments; but I doubt very much if they will be referred, because it is not desired to open the whole case. The case of the nominations in the Navy is very different from that of the Army nominations. The Navy nominations are for promotion or for original appointment. It will not make the slightest difference whether or not they are confirmed at this session, because they will hold until the 30th of December of next year.

Mr. SWANSON. The temporary appointments do.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; they all hold; they are not thrown out as the Army officers would be; but that question has not been decided by the committee. I do not think the committee is going to report, and I hope it will not report—certainly it will not do so with my assent—the nominations of officers to take charge of bureaus.

As to the Marine Corps appointments, they have not come in, and will not come in until the 15th of February.

Mr. SWANSON. Now, I should like to say to the Senator that as to the Army appointments, I can see why he might desire perhaps that those above the grade of colonel should not be considered; but it does seem to me that at least the others, where properly made in accordance with Army recommendations, ought to go to the committee. It took us nearly two years to reorganize the Army; it has been two years since the armistice was signed. Practically all of those whose names are on the list were gallant officers. I have received a number of letters setting forth the privations and dangers which they suffered and the records which they made. They ought to have been rewarded long ago, but the matter has been delayed on account of the reorganization of the Army; it could not be adjusted until that question had been settled.

I should like to appeal to the Senator to allow all these appointments to go to the committee. If they go to the committee, a majority of Republicans constitute the committee, and if there is in the list a single political appointment of brigadier general or major general, or if there is one whose record in the opinion of any Senator does not justify the appointment—and most of the records were made in Europe—if there is one who does not deserve promotion, one Senator can hold up his nomination; but it does seem to me that where the Senate is practically unanimous—and it can only work by unanimity in connection with these confirmations—in view of the fact that the reward of these splendid, gallant soldiers has been delayed two years, it is wrong not to let their nominations be referred to the committee, so that the committee may report in cases where there is no opposition.

Mr. LODGE. But the whole list must be gone over, as the Senator well knows, and I think it is much less of a reflection on anybody to let them all stand over. In four weeks or so the nominations will all be disposed of, and without any question the officers will get the honors which they deserve. I think in all likelihood the same names may come back.

Mr. SWANSON. If all these nominations are allowed to go over, I can understand that some officer, perhaps, will feel that there is implied an insinuation to the effect that he was promoted because of personal preference or something of that sort. I do not believe any of them were promoted for any such reason. I have had letters from some of the officers who have

been nominated brigadier generals, who have sent me their records in a quiet, modest, and unostentatious way, and I believe there is not a Government in the world, in view of the records that some of these officers have made, which would not have promoted them within 30 days after the war was over. The officers of our Army have been waiting for nearly two years, and now the matter is to be delayed longer. All that is asked in behalf of these officers is that the committee of which the Senator from New York is chairman may be allowed to consider the nominations. If there is anything wrong, he will be able to discover it and hold back any appointments where there is a contest. The committee is dominated by our Republican friends.

Mr. LODGE. It is not a question who dominates the committee. If we are going to send the nominations of any of these officers to the committee we must send all nominations in all branches of the service to the committee. There is no reflection on anybody, but I think when it comes to appointing 33 generals to fill those grades for many months to come that the new President who has been elected should at least have an opportunity of looking over the list.

Mr. SWANSON. We have not asked any action in the case of political appointments. I know what occurred here eight years ago. I am always frank and candid, and I will say that I then helped to filibuster against confirmations for political appointments, such as postmaster. There was a conflict on that occasion; but the Democratic Senators at that time did not endeavor to obstruct the confirmation of military officers, nor did they attempt to obstruct the confirmation of naval officers or officers of the Public Health Service, or in any case where it was necessary that appointments should be made. In all such cases we waived our objection. I ask the Senator to allow the nominations to go to the committee.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator knows that at that time we had not come out of a great war, and that 33 generals were not appointed all at once.

Mr. SWANSON. Yes; but now we have come out of a great war, and we have delayed for more than two years honoring some of those who deserved honor. That is what I protest against. They performed an unusual service; there was unusual gallantry; there was unusual bravery and ability; and yet we have delayed two years rewarding them, and now objections are interposed even to considering rewarding them. I think it is wrong. I think the nominations ought to go to the committee. I shall be satisfied with any report made by the splendid chairman of that committee. If there were any appointment which he wished to have go over, I would not ask to have it confirmed, but there are many gallant officers whose names are on the list, and I feel they should be confirmed.

I repeat, the delay has been already long enough. The delay, in the first place, was occasioned by the action of Congress upon the Army reorganization bill. It does seem to me in bad grace to say that we will not even let the cases of these officers be considered; so I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will relent and allow the Army and Navy appointments, at least, to go to the committees.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, in my judgment, the Senator from New York, in stating that he thinks, in view of the facts, these nominations ought to be referred to the committee and considered by the committee, has done credit to his fairness and his courage. The Senator from Massachusetts, however, while declaring that there is no politics involved in the course determined upon by the majority as led by him not to give consideration to these nominations, made a declaration which I think is deserving of notice at this time. He implied, if he did not expressly declare, that political considerations controlled the choice of the commander in chief of the American Expeditionary Forces and prevented the sending of Gen. Wood and another as commanders or as officers to France.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, I never meant to imply anything of the sort. Gen. Wood was prevented from going in command of a division; there was no question about the commander in chief; and Col. Roosevelt wanted to go as brigadier general in a division and not in command of a division. Neither was talked of for commander in chief. I never made any objection of that sort. I said if there was any politics it was shown in those instances.

Mr. ROBINSON. The plain implication in the Senator's statement was that the failure to send Gen. Wood and Col. Roosevelt abroad was due to politics. It could have no other meaning. The Senator from Massachusetts is not lacking in ability to express himself either clearly or by innuendo. The only effect of his reference to the failure or refusal to send Gen. Wood abroad was to make the declaration, either expressly or impliedly, that political considerations controlled.

Mr. President, when it became necessary to select a commander in chief of the American Expeditionary Forces the choice rested upon an officer who throughout his career had been a Republican. In selecting Gen. Pershing to command our forces abroad I believe that the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States not only did what he thought was his duty to the country but that he acted wisely.

It is a well-known fact that President Wilson sent no general to France that Pershing did not want, and it is equally well known that President Wilson and the War Department kept no officer at home that Pershing wanted. The reason for pursuing that course was not based on political considerations; it was based upon the fact that upon Gen. Pershing rested the gravest, perhaps the sublimest, responsibility that has ever fallen upon a soldier in the United States Army; and let me say in this connection that the policy pursued by the President and by the War Department in sending no officer to France that Pershing did not want, and in keeping no one at home that he asked for, has been vindicated by the result.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield with pleasure to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. McCORMICK. Did I understand the Senator to say that Gen. Pershing did not want Theodore Roosevelt sent to France?

Mr. ROBINSON. I say that Gen. Pershing was permitted to have every officer that he requested, and no officer was thrust upon him. The Senator, of course, knows that Mr. Roosevelt was not an officer. He was not even in the Army of the United States; and, perhaps, as Mr. Roosevelt, that question could not have arisen as to him. The fact of the matter is that Mr. Roosevelt was not in the Army and was not an officer.

But, Mr. President, I am not willing that this debate shall be diverted from the issue that is of importance, and that is that we ought to keep the Army out of politics; that we ought to do justice to brave soldiers who, as a result of their service, have been named for promotion.

It was inevitable, sir, that in selecting a list of 22 to be made brigadier generals and 11 to be made major generals, some officers of distinction and of valor should be omitted from the list. No one questions that there are names that ought to receive further distinction; but I make the declaration that the Senate of the United States, charged with the responsibility of advising and consenting to these nominations, ought to display its courage, and act upon them. It ought not to pursue the cowardly course of denying to these brave soldiers the opportunity of a hearing before its own committee.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] may declare that there is no politics in it; but the only purpose of the course being pursued is to give an incoming President the opportunity to send a new list of names to the Senate of the United States. If the majority want to pursue that course, if the majority want to reject these names that are before the Senate or withhold action on them, let them do so; but let us not take that course until we have at least shown some consideration to the officers who are named for promotion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). The pending question, as the Chair understands, is the reference to the committee of the nomination of Gen. Frank McIntyre. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it will be so ordered.

Mr. ROBINSON. Have the other nominations been referred?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 4 (legislative day of February 2), 1921.

REAPPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES.

Bureau of Insular Affairs.

Maj. Gen. Frank McIntyre, United States Army, to be Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, with the rank of major general, for a period of four years from August 17, 1920, with rank from October 6, 1917.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES.

To be colonels with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. William Allen Phillips, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Ervin Louis Phillips, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. Samuel Dickerson Rockenbach, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. Robert Cutts Williams, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. Walter Cowen Short, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. George Columbus Barnhardt, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. James Haynes Reeves, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. Kirby Walker, Cavalry.

Lieut. Col. Claude Bernard Sweezey, Cavalry, since retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. Sterling Price Adams, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. Julian Robert Lindsey, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. Julius Theodore Conrad, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. Howard Russell Hickok, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. Marcus Butler Stokes, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Samuel McPherson Rutherford, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. John Henry Parker, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. John Edwin Woodward, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. George McDougall Weeks, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Isaac Erwin, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Samuel Vinton Ham, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Robert Walter Mearns, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Henry Lee Kinnison, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Guy George Palmer, Infantry, since retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. Orrin Rawson Wolfe, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Joseph Edward Cusack, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. Meriwether Lewis Walker, Corps of Engineers.
Lieut. Col. Robert Rossiter Raymond, Corps of Engineers.
Lieut. Col. Samuel John Bayard Schindel, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. William Renwick Smedberg, jr., Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. Howard Louis Laubach, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. John M. Morgan, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. Andrew Erwin Williams, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. Walter Crosby Babcock, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. Herbert Ball Crosby, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. Benjamin Bremner Hyer, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. Mathew Charles Smith, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. Kenzie Wallace Walker, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. Howard Rand Perry, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Lincoln Fay Kilbourne, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. William Brooke, Infantry, since retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. George Hairston Jamerson, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Hunter Bithal Nelson, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Odus Creamer Horney, Ordnance Department.
Lieut. Col. Frank Ellis Bamford, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Fredrik Lorensten Knudsen, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. William Baker Ladue, Corps of Engineers.
Lieut. Col. William Jones Barden, Corps of Engineers.
Lieut. Col. Edward Philip O'Hern, Ordnance Department.
Lieut. Col. Charles William Castle, Infantry, since retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. Francis LeJan Parker, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. George French Hamilton, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. Paul Bernard Malone, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. John White Craig, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. John Fisher Preston, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Hugh Douglas Berkeley, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. Albert Eugene Saxton, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. Hamilton Smith Hawkins, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. Charles Frederic Crain, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Frank Sherwood Cocheu, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Ora Elmer Hunt, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Frank Parker, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. John Campbell McArthur, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Frank David Ely, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Edwin Bell, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Otho Bane Rosenbaum, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. George Henson Estes, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. George Vidmer, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. Oliver Edwards, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. William Ernest Welsh, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Frederick G. Stritzinger, jr., Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Charles Curtis Smith, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Frank Livells Wells, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Briant Harris Wells, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Pegram Whitworth, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Frank James Morrow, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Robert Sanford Odley, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Edward Hugh Schulz, Corps of Engineers.
Lieut. Col. Harry Burgess, Corps of Engineers.
Lieut. Col. Casper Hauzer Conrad, jr., Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. Charles Herman Paine, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Thales Lucius Ames, Ordnance Department.
Lieut. Col. Nathan K. Averill, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. Harry LaTourette Cavenaugh, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. Mortimer Osborne Bigelow, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. August Carl Nissen, Cavalry.
Lieut. Col. Thomas Walter Darragh, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Americus Mitchell, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. Perry Lester Miles, Infantry.
Lieut. Col. James Ackerman Lynch, Infantry.

- Lieut. Col. Milton Loomis McGrew, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Clyde Emile Hawkins, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. Lorrain Thompson Richardson, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. James Southard Parker, Cavalry, subject to examination required by law, since retired from active service.
 Lieut. Col. Charles Roscoe Howland, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Louis Meredith Nuttman, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Glenn Hedges Davis, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Joseph Southerland Herron, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. Thomas Francis Dwyer, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Lieut. Col. Benjamin Taylor Simmons, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Girard Sturtevant, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Louis Hermann Bash, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Frank Bingly Watson, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Oscar Jerome Charles, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Thomas Absolam Pearce, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Robert Henry Allen, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Dwight Warren Ryther, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Alvord Van Patten Anderson, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. Edward Theodore Hartmann, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Frederick Benjamin Shaw, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. William Burr Cochran, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Harry Frederick Rethers, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. George Matthias Hoffman, Corps of Engineers.
 Lieut. Col. LeRoy Eltinge, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. John Buffalo Christian, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Lieut. Col. George Williams Moses, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. Charles Ezra Stodter, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. Alexander Macomb Miller, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. Charles Bryant Drake, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. Harry Ormiston Willard, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. Herschel Tupes, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. John Parsons Wade, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. Isaac Newell, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Lawrence Burton Simonds, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Ola Walter Bell, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. Abraham Grant Lott, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. Merch Bradt Stewart, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Frederick Worthington Lewis, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Edward Leonard King, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. Dennis Edward Nolan, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. James Newell Pickering, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Reynolds Johnston Burt, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Samuel Field Dallam, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. William Kelly, jr., Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. Russell Creamer Langdon, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Harry Herbert Tebbetts, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Henry Charles Whitehead, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. George Swazey Goodale, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. William Dixon Chitty, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. Frank Crandall Bolles, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Alfred Eldrekin Kennington, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. Edward Percy Orton, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. Alexander Thompson Ovenshine, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Henry Edgar Eames, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Paul Giddings, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. George Lawrence Byroade, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Edward Seymour Walton, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Alfred Theodore Smith, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Fred Leigh Munson, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Thomas McArthur Anderson, jr., Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. William Durward Connor, Corps of Engineers.
 Lieut. Col. John Calvin Oakes, Corps of Engineers.
 Lieut. Col. Sherwood Alfred Cheney, Corps of Engineers.
 Lieut. Col. Frederick William Altstaetter, Corps of Engineers, since retired from active service.
 Lieut. Col. Harley Bascom Ferguson, Corps of Engineers.
 Lieut. Col. Charles Du Val Roberts, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Robert Swepston Abernethy, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Lieut. Col. Francis Horton Pope, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. George Edward Mitchell, Cavalry.
 Maj. Pierce Ambrose Murphy, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. Mervyn Chandos Buckey, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Frederick Theodore Arnold, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. Frederick Edgar Johnston, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Lieut. Col. Claude Hamilton Miller, Infantry.
 Maj. James Noble Munro, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. Harold Benjamin Fiske, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Earle D'Arcy Pearce, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. William Stanley Valentine, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. Arthur Stewart Conklin, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Henry Carpenter Smither, Cavalry.
 Maj. Roy Beveridge Harper, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. John Hendricken Hughes, Infantry.
 Maj. Thomas Arnett Roberts, Cavalry.
 Maj. Edgar Alexander Sirmyer, Cavalry.
 Maj. Frank Ross McCoy, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. George Willis Helms, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Rufus Estes Longan, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. William Mason Fassett, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Halstead Dorey, Infantry.
 Maj. Chalmers Gaither Hall, Cavalry.
 Maj. Clarence Richmond Day, Cavalry.
 Maj. George Franklin Baltzell, Infantry.
 Maj. Willard Herman McCornack, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. James Francis Brady, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Edgar Thomas Conley, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Roderick Leland Carnichael, Finance Department.
 Lieut. Col. Andrew Moses, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Edgar Thomas Collins, Infantry.
 Maj. Preston Brown, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Thomas Quinn Ashburn, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Lieut. Col. Sam Frank Bottoms, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Charles Higbee Bridges, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Harold Edward Cloke, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Lieut. Col. Samuel Curtis Vestal, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Robert McCleave, Infantry.
 Maj. James Villard Heidt, Infantry.
 Maj. Charles Sherman Lincoln, Infantry.
 Maj. Patrick Henry Mullan, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Philip Raymond Ward, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Lieut. Col. Frank Cranstoun Boggs, Corps of Engineers.
 Lieut. Col. Clarke Stull Smith, Corps of Engineers.
 Lieut. Col. William Preston Wooten, Corps of Engineers.
 Lieut. Col. Lytle Brown, Corps of Engineers.
 Lieut. Col. Earl Ivan Brown, Corps of Engineers.
 Lieut. Col. Amos Alfred Fries, Chemical Warfare Service.
 Maj. Monroe Crawford Kerth, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. George Adolphus Nugent, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Lieut. Col. Curtis William Otwell, Corps of Engineers.
 Lieut. Col. William Edward Cole, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Lieut. Col. Marcellus Garner Spinks, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Lambert Whitfield Jordan, jr., Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Jacob Calvin Johnson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. James Bartholomew Gowen, Infantry.
 Maj. Harvey Wolfarth Miller, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Edwin Dyson Bricker, Ordnance Department.
 Maj. Daniel Greenwood Berry, Infantry.
 Maj. Malin Craig, Cavalry.
 Maj. Ralph Elliot Ingram, Infantry.
 Maj. Robert Courtney Davis, Infantry.
 Maj. Joseph Frank Janda, Infantry.
 Maj. Ira Clinton Welborn, Infantry.
 Maj. Alexander Elliot Williams, Infantry.
 Maj. Charles Wesley Exton, Infantry.
 Maj. Guy Vernor Henry, Cavalry.
 Maj. Conrad Stanton Babcock, Cavalry.
 Maj. Chauncey Benton Humphrey, Infantry.
 Maj. Berkeley Enochs, Infantry.
 Maj. G. Maury Crallé, Infantry.
 Maj. Joseph Franklin Gohn, Infantry.
 Maj. James Heyward Bradford, jr., Infantry.
 Maj. Wallace Bryan Scales, Cavalry.
 Maj. David Lamme Stone, Infantry.
 Maj. Ewing E. Booth, Cavalry.
 Maj. Alfred William Bjornstad, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Amos William Kimball, Quartermaster Corps.
 Lieut. Col. William Edward Horton, Quartermaster Corps.
 Lieut. Col. B. Frank Cheatham, Quartermaster Corps.
 Lieut. Col. George Guilford Bailey, Quartermaster Corps.
 Lieut. Col. Carl Frederick Hartmann, Signal Corps, since retired from active service.
 Lieut. Col. Basil Overby Lenoir, Signal Corps.
 Lieut. Col. William Mitchell, Signal Corps.
 Lieut. Col. Robert Edward Wyllie, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Patrick Aloysius Connolly, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Malcolm Young, Coast Artillery Corps, since retired from active service.
 Maj. John Jacob Boniface, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. Laurence Clay Brown, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. John Bernard Schoeffel, Infantry.
 Maj. Walter Trotter Bates, Infantry.
 Maj. Englebert Glover Ovenshine, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Harry Lee Steele, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Benjamin Patten Nicklin, Infantry.
 Maj. John William French, Infantry.
 Maj. Cromwell Stacey, Infantry.
 Maj. William Annesley Cavanaugh, Infantry.
 Maj. George Madden Grimes, Infantry.

- Maj. Thomas Raine Harker, Infantry.
 Maj. Frank Dickenson Wickham, Infantry.
 Maj. Bryan Conrad, Infantry, since retired from active service.
 Maj. William Keith Naylor, Infantry.
 Maj. William Harrison Oury, Infantry.
 Maj. Austin Freeman Prescott, Infantry.
 Maj. Edgar Allen Fry, Infantry.
 Maj. Rush Spencer Wells, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. James Brady Mitchell, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Herbert Jay Brees, Cavalry.
 Maj. Harry Anthony Eaton, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. George Hoffman Penrose, Quartermaster Corps.
 Lieut. Col. Alfred Sully Morgan, Finance Department.
 Lieut. Col. Charles Henry Hilton, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Lieut. Col. William Fayssoux Stewart, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Campbell King, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Joseph Benjamin Douglas, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Lieut. Col. Hudson Taylor Patten, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Tenney Ross, Infantry.
 Maj. Edward Kimmel, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. John Robert Procter, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Frederick William Phisterer, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Robert Hall Campbell Kelton, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Percy Poe Bishop, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Robert Osborn Van Horn, Infantry.
 Maj. Ezekiel James Williams, Infantry.
 Maj. Moor Neilson Falls, Infantry.
 Maj. Henry James Hatch, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. William Frederick Hase, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. William Richard Doores, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Lieut. Col. Alfred Andrews Starbird, Field Artillery.
 Maj. John Robert Rigby Hannay, Infantry.
 Maj. James Frederick Howell, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. James Malcolm Graham, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Joseph Lee Gilbreth, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. John Carroll Goodfellow, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Lieut. Col. Charles Frederic Humphrey, jr., Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Willey Howell, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. George Jean Holden, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. John Thomas Geary, Coast Artillery Corps.
To be colonel with rank from July 10, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Charles Francis Bates, Infantry.
To be colonel with rank from July 11, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Charles Carrol Todd, Infantry.
To be colonels with rank from July 12, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. John James Toffey, jr., Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Carl Anson Martin, Infantry.
To be colonels with rank from July 16, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Mark Wheeler, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. George Daniels Arrowsmith, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Edward Carpenter, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Lieut. Col. Ivers Whitman Leonard, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Pearl Michael Shaffer, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Laurence Albert Curtis, Infantry, since retired from active service.
 Lieut. Col. Robert Robins Wallach, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. William Henry Jordan, jr., Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. George Williams, Cavalry.
To be colonels with rank from July 17, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Irving Joseph Carr, Signal Corps.
 Lieut. Col. Easton Rutledge Gibson, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Henry Churchill Bonnycastle, Quartermaster Corps.
 Lieut. Col. Edward Croft, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Adolphe Hart Huguot, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Raymond Sheldon, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. James Davis Taylor, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Frank Halstead, Infantry.
To be colonels with rank from July 18, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Harry Edward Knight, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Woodson Hocker, Infantry.
To be colonel with rank from July 19, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Archie Jesse Harris, Infantry.
To be colonels with rank from July 20, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Alexander James Macnab, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Henry Macpherson Merriam, Coast Artillery Corps.
To be colonels with rank from July 24, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Oliver Lyman Spaulding, jr., Field Artillery.
 Lieut. Col. Hanson Briscoe Black, Signal Corps.
To be colonel with rank from July 29, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Conrad Hammond Lanza, Field Artillery.
To be colonel with rank from August 1, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Charles Sidney Haight, Cavalry.
To be colonel with rank from August 6, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. William Dennison Forsyth, Cavalry.
To be colonel with rank from August 17, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Fitzhugh Lee, Cavalry.
To be colonel with rank from August 22, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Ralph Brewster Parrott, Infantry.
To be colonels with rank from September 1, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Harry Parker Wilbur, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Lieut. Col. Stanley Hamer Ford, Infantry.
To be colonel with rank from September 3, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Robert Mauro Brambila, Infantry.
To be colonel with rank from September 10, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Elijah Bishop Martindale, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
To be colonels with rank from September 15, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. John Nicholas Straat, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Earle White Tanner, Infantry.
To be colonel with rank from September 22, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Henry Slocum Wagner, Infantry.
To be colonel with rank from September 28, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Frederick Guy Knabenshue, Infantry.
To be colonel with rank from October 5, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Thomas Jefferson Powers, Infantry.
To be colonel with rank from October 17, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Charles Steuart Wallace, Signal Corps.
To be colonel with rank from October 28, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. William Sanders Scott, Quartermaster Corps.
To be colonel with rank from November 1, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Robert Henry Rolfe, Quartermaster Corps.
To be colonel with rank from November 3, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Martin Lalor Crimmins, Infantry.
To be colonel with rank from November 13, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Louis Ford Garrard, Quartermaster Corps.
To be colonel with rank from November 14, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. James Monroe Love, jr., Infantry.
To be colonels with rank from November 16, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Paul Hester McCook, Infantry.
 Lieut. Col. Frederick William Coleman, Finance Department.
To be colonel with rank from November 17, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Frederick Singleton Lewis Price, Infantry.
To be colonel with rank from November 19, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. George Bahnsen Pond, Infantry.
To be colonel with rank from November 24, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Dana True Merrill, Infantry.
To be colonel with rank from December 14, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Theodore Anderson Baldwin, jr., Infantry.
To be colonel with rank from December 23, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Arthur Latham Conger, Infantry.
To be colonel with rank from December 25, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. James Brown Kemper, Infantry.
To be colonel with rank from January 6, 1921.
 Lieut. Col. John Winthrop Barnes, Infantry.
To be colonel with rank from January 19, 1921.
 Lieut. Col. George Elmer Thorne, Infantry.
To be lieutenant colonels with rank from July 1, 1920.
 Maj. Joseph Lee Gilbreth, Infantry.
 Maj. John Carroll Goodfellow, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Charles Frederic Humphrey, jr., Infantry.
 Maj. George Jean Holden, Infantry.
 Maj. John Thomas Geary, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Charles Francis Bates, Infantry.
 Maj. Charles Carrol Todd, Infantry.
 Maj. John James Toffey, jr., Infantry.
 Maj. Carl Anson Martin, Infantry.
 Maj. Mark Wheeler, Infantry.
 Maj. George Daniels Arrowsmith, Infantry.
 Maj. Edward Carpenter, Coast Artillery Corps.

Maj. Ivers Whitman Leonard, Infantry.
 Maj. Pearl Michael Shaffer, Infantry.
 Maj. Laurence Albert Curtis, Infantry, since retired from active service.
 Maj. Robert Robins Wallach, Cavalry.
 Maj. William Henry Jordan, jr., Infantry.
 Maj. George Williams, Cavalry.
 Maj. Irving Joseph Carr, Infantry.
 Maj. Easton Rutledge Gibson, Infantry.
 Maj. Henry Churchill Bonnycastle, Infantry.
 Maj. Edward Croft, Infantry.
 Maj. Adolphe Hart Huguet, Infantry.
 Maj. Raymond Shelden, Infantry.
 Maj. James Davis Taylor, Infantry.
 Maj. Frank Halstead, Infantry.
 Maj. Harry Edward Knight, Infantry.
 Maj. Woodson Hocker, Infantry.
 Maj. Archie Jesse Harris, Infantry.
 Maj. Alexander James Macnab, Infantry.
 Maj. Henry Macpherson Merriam, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Hanson Briscoe Black, Infantry.
 Maj. Charles Sidney Haight, Cavalry.
 Maj. William Dennison Forsyth, Cavalry.
 Maj. Fitzhugh Lee, Cavalry.
 Maj. Ralph Brewster Parrott, Infantry.
 Maj. Harry Parker Wilbur, Field Artillery.
 Maj. Stanley Hamer Ford, Infantry.
 Maj. Robert Mauro Brambila, Infantry.
 Maj. Elijah Bishop Martindale, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. John Nicholas Straat, Infantry.
 Maj. Earle White Tanner, Infantry.
 Maj. Henry Slocum Wagner, Infantry.
 Maj. Frederick Guy Knabenshue, Infantry.
 Maj. Thomas Jefferson Powers, Infantry.
 Maj. Martin Lalor Crimmins, Infantry.
 Maj. James Monroe Love, jr., Infantry.
 Maj. Paul Hester McCook, Infantry.
 Maj. Frederick William Coleman, Infantry.
 Maj. Frederick Singleton Lewis Price, Infantry.
 Maj. George Bahnsen Pond, Infantry.
 Maj. Dana True Merrill, Infantry.
 Maj. Theodore Anderson Baldwin, jr., Infantry.
 Maj. Arthur Latham Conger, Infantry.
 Maj. James Brown Kemper, Infantry.
 Maj. John Winthrop Barnes, Infantry.
 Maj. George Elmer Thorne, Infantry.
 Maj. Alfred Aloe, Infantry.
 Maj. Frank Wheaton Rowell, Infantry.
 Maj. Hugh Aloysius Drum, Infantry.
 Maj. James Bradner Allison, Infantry.
 Maj. John Lesesue De Witt, Infantry.
 Maj. Clifton Comly Kinney, Infantry.
 Maj. James Fuller McKinley, Cavalry.
 Maj. LeVert Coleman, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Frank Carson Jewell, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Patrick William Guiney, Cavalry.
 Maj. Charles Brooks Clark, Infantry.
 Maj. Herman Walter Schull, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Leon Benjamin Kromer, Cavalry.
 Maj. Charles Annesley Romeyn, Cavalry.
 Maj. Henry Benjamin Clark, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. George Sherwin Simonds, Infantry.
 Maj. Francis Neal Cooke, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Stanley Dunbar Embick, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Evan Harris Humphrey, Cavalry.
 Maj. Robert Halford Peck, Infantry.
 Maj. Halsey Edward Yates, Infantry.
 Maj. Clement Augustus Trott, Infantry.
 Maj. Stuart Heintzelman, Cavalry.
 Maj. Laurence Halstead, Infantry.
 Maj. Frederick William Van Dwyne, Infantry.
 Maj. John Dudley Long, Cavalry.
 Maj. Warren Dean, Cavalry.
 Maj. Grayson Villard Heidt, Cavalry.
 Maj. James Cooper Rhea, Cavalry.
 Maj. James Henson, Infantry.
 Maj. Fred Radford Brown, Infantry.
 Maj. William Topping Merry, Infantry.
 Maj. Lawrence Du Val Cabell, Infantry.
 Maj. Clyffard Game, Infantry.
 Maj. George Washington Stuart, Infantry.
 Maj. William Taylor Patten, Infantry.
 Maj. Duncan Kennedy Major, jr., Infantry.
 Maj. James Justice, Infantry.
 Maj. Llewellyn William Oliver, Cavalry.

Maj. Reginald Edwards McNally, Cavalry.
 Maj. Ephraim Geoffrey Peyton, Infantry.
 Maj. William Lewis Reed, Infantry.
 Maj. Albert N. McClure, Cavalry.
 Maj. Ben Holloday Dorcy, Cavalry.
 Maj. Edwin Albert Hickman, Cavalry.
 Maj. Charles Louis McKain, Infantry.
 Maj. Andrew Jackson Dougherty, Infantry.
 Maj. Oliver Stevens Eskridge, Infantry.
 Maj. Joel Robert Lee, Infantry.
 Maj. George Evans Stewart, Infantry.
 Maj. Alden Cook Knowles, Infantry.
 Maj. Henry Aloysius Hanigan, Infantry.
 Maj. Hjalmer Erickson, Infantry.
 Maj. James Wadsworth Furlow, Infantry.
 Maj. John Womack Wright, Infantry.
 Maj. Frederick Rudolph De Funiak, jr., Infantry.
 Maj. Ralph McCoy, Infantry.
 Maj. Grosvenor Lowrey Townsend, Infantry.
 Maj. Thomas Leverett Brewer, Infantry.
 Maj. James Kelly Parsons, Infantry.
 Maj. George Edward Ball, Infantry.
 Maj. Reuben Smith, Infantry.
 Maj. Clarence Browning Smith, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Russell Potter Reeder, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Howard Campbell Price, Infantry.
 Maj. Walter Bogardus McCaskey, Infantry.
 Maj. Oliver Hart Dockery, jr., Infantry.
 Maj. John Robert Thomas, jr., Infantry.
 Maj. Milton Artells Elliott, jr., Infantry.
 Maj. Robert Franklin McMillan, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. George Doane Freeman, jr., Infantry.
 Maj. William Elmer Hunt, Infantry.
 Maj. Ernest Eddy Haskell, Infantry.
 Maj. Warren Webster Whitside, Cavalry.
 Maj. Jack Hayes, Infantry.
 Maj. William Henry Waldron, Infantry.
 Maj. Godwin Ordway, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Joseph Kepner Partello, Infantry.
 Maj. Leon La Grange Roach, Infantry.
 Maj. Frederick Curtis Johnson, Cavalry.
 Maj. Horace Potts Hobbs, Infantry.
 Maj. Louis Joseph Van Schaick, Infantry.
 Maj. Guy Cushman, Cavalry.
 Maj. Edgar Albert Myer, Infantry.
 Maj. James Dean Tilford, Cavalry.
 Maj. Arthur Morson Shipp, Infantry.
 Maj. Joseph William Beacham, jr., Infantry.
 Maj. Guy Stevens Norvell, Cavalry.
 Maj. Francis Joseph McConnell, Infantry.
 Maj. Robert Hayes Wescott, Infantry.
 Maj. Paul Hurst, Infantry.
 Maj. Allen Parker, Infantry.
 Maj. Allen Smith, jr., Infantry.
 Maj. John Baxter Sanford, Infantry.
 Maj. Frank Burson Hawkins, Infantry.
 Maj. Paul Tropier Hayne, jr., Cavalry.
 Maj. Fred Erskine Buchan, Cavalry.
 Maj. Edward Albert Sturges, Cavalry.
 Maj. William Luke Luhn, Cavalry.
 Maj. Hu Blakemore Myers, Cavalry.
 Maj. Henry Russell Richmond, Cavalry.
 Maj. John Joseph Ryan, Cavalry.
 Maj. Charles Evans Kilbourne, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Osmun Latrobe, jr., Cavalry.
 Maj. George Arthur Hadsell, Infantry.
 Maj. Wait Chatterton Johnson, Infantry.
 Maj. James Millard Little, Infantry.
 Maj. John Lawrence Bond, Infantry.
 Maj. Joseph Samuel Cecil, Infantry.
 Maj. Edward Raymond Stone, Infantry.
 Maj. Albert Raymond Dillingham, Infantry.
 Maj. William Richie Gibson, Infantry.
 Maj. Will H. Point, Infantry.
 Maj. Henry McCauley Bankhead, Infantry.
 Maj. William Murray Connell, Cavalry.
 Maj. Theodore Burnett Taylor, Cavalry.
 Maj. James Longstreet, Cavalry.
 Maj. Henry Ashley Ripley, Infantry.
 Maj. William Harrison Monroe, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. William Albert Kent, Infantry.
 Maj. Theodore Schultz, Cavalry.
 Maj. Alvan Cullom Gillem, Cavalry.
 Maj. William Benton Cowin, Cavalry.
 Maj. Richard Ten Broeck Ellis, Coast Artillery Corps.

Maj. Frederick William Stopford, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Henry Holden Sheen, Quartermaster Corps.
 Maj. John Wiley Gulick, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Ernest Rollin Tilton, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Homer Blackie Grant, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Alexander Greig, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. James Alfred Ruggles, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Harry William Newton, Coast Artillery Corps, since retired from active service.
 Maj. Allen Dwight Raymond, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. James Robert Pourie, Quartermaster Corps.
 Maj. John William Cruikshank Abbott, Coast Artillery Corps, since retired from active service.
 Maj. Harry Thomas Matthews, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Harry Cooper Barnes, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Louis Stewart Chappelle, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Granville Sevier, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Robert Frame Woods, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Albert Clifton Thompson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Ellison Lindsay Gilmer, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. John McBride, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, since retired from active service.
 Maj. Richard Kerr Cravens, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. George Oremaudle Hubbard, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. James Menzo Wheeler, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Harrison Summers Kerrick, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Walter Campbell Sweeney, Infantry.
 Maj. Philip Sheridan Golderman, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Charles Lewis Lanham, Finance Department.
 Maj. George Francis Connelly, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Joseph Sanders Hardin, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Roger Stanley Fitch, Cavalry.
 Maj. Samuel Wheelan Noyes, Infantry.
 Maj. Charles Warren Weeks, Infantry.
 Maj. James Thornton Watson, Infantry.
 Maj. William Wallace McCammon, Infantry.
 Maj. Willis Prague Coleman, Infantry.
 Maj. Albert Brown Sloan, Infantry.
 Maj. Lucius Cincinnati Bennett, Infantry.
 Maj. John Ernest Morris, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. Lawrence Parker Butler, Infantry.
 Maj. Paul Corbin Galleher, Infantry.
 Maj. Claude Sharp Fries, Infantry.
 Maj. William Greenough Doane, Infantry.
 Maj. James Mobley Kimbrough, jr., Infantry.
 Maj. Alvin Kelley Baskette, Infantry.
 Maj. James George Hannah, Infantry.
 Maj. Samuel Breck McIntyre, Infantry.
 Maj. Milosh Radosablavitz Hilgard, Infantry.
 Maj. Linwood Ellsworth Hanson, Infantry.
 Maj. Charles Bertody Stone, jr., Infantry.
 Maj. Frank Harold Burton, Infantry.
 Maj. George Buckner Sharon, Infantry.
 Maj. George Hubert White, Infantry.
 Maj. Harris Pendleton, jr., Infantry.
 Maj. William Gingrich Fleischhauer, Infantry.
 Maj. Howard Gilman Davids, Infantry.
 Maj. Ernest Van Dyke Murphy, Infantry.
 Maj. Hilden Olin, Infantry.
 Maj. Frederick Goedecke, Infantry.
 Maj. Albert Watson Alden Foreman, Infantry.
 Maj. William Sanford Mapes, Infantry.
 Maj. Samuel Aldrich Price, Infantry, since retired from active service.
 Maj. Perrin Lindsey Smith, Infantry.
 Maj. Harry Lawrence Cooper, Infantry.
 Maj. William Stanley Sinclair, Infantry.
 Maj. Leslie Arthur Isaac Chapman, Cavalry.
 Maj. Charles Louis Willard, Infantry.
 Maj. Robert Henry Sillman, Infantry.
 Maj. Arthur Pitt Watts, Infantry.
 Maj. Thaddeus Brem Seigle, Infantry.
 Maj. William Arthur Carleton, Infantry.
 Maj. Lochlin Washington Caffey, Infantry.
 Maj. William Saunders Faulkner, Infantry.
 Maj. Ernest H. Agnew, Infantry.
 Maj. Robert Oakes Ragsdale, Infantry.
 Maj. Austin Allen Parker, Infantry.
 Maj. Fred Van Schaick Chamberlain, Infantry.
 Maj. Aubrey Lippincott, Cavalry.
 Maj. Sylvester Bonnaffon, Infantry, since retired from active service.
 Maj. Robert Christian Humber, Infantry.
 Maj. George Luther Hicks, Coast Artillery Corps.

Maj. John Henry Page, jr., Infantry.
 Maj. Parker Hitt, Infantry.
 Maj. Paul Ward Beck, Infantry.
 Maj. John Morris Field, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry.
 Maj. Edwin Joseph Griffith, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry.
 Maj. Lynn Sawyer Edwards, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Robert Irwin Rees, Infantry.
 Maj. John Joseph Miller, Infantry.
 Maj. Hugh Kirkpatrick Taylor, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Jesse Marling Cullison, Infantry.
 Maj. William Henry Noble, Infantry.
 Maj. Wilbur Anderson McDaniel, Infantry.
 Maj. Douglas McCaskey, Cavalry.
 Maj. Evert Roscoe Wilson, Infantry.
 Maj. Samuel Burnette Pearson, Cavalry.
 Maj. Freeborn Page Holcomb, Cavalry.
 Maj. Clenard McLaughlin, Infantry.
 Maj. Edward Beall Mitchell, Infantry.
 Maj. James Henry Como, Infantry.
 Maj. Harol Dever Coburn, Infantry.
 Maj. Allen James Greer, Infantry.
 Maj. Robert Whitfield, Infantry.
 Maj. Frank Scott Long, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. John Porterfield Spurr, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Samuel Grant Shartle, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Michael Henry Barry, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. James Mifflin Loud, Infantry.
 Maj. John De Camp Hall, Infantry.
 Maj. Davis Catlin Anderson, Infantry.
 Maj. Douglas Potts, Infantry.
 Maj. Stephen Ogden Fuqua, Infantry.
 Maj. Daniel Van Voorhis, Cavalry.
 Maj. Vincent Martin Elmore, Infantry.
 Maj. Benjamin Robert Wade, Infantry.
 Maj. Julien Edmond Gaujot, Cavalry.
 Maj. Delphay Truman Ellsworth Casteel, Cavalry.
 Maj. George Edwards Goodrich, Infantry.
 Maj. Joseph Robert McAndrews, Cavalry.
 Maj. Edwin Simpson Hartshorn, Infantry.
 Maj. George Edward Lovell, Cavalry.
 Maj. William Preston Screws, Infantry.
 Maj. Ralph Brown Lister, Infantry.
 Maj. Frank Luther Case, Cavalry.
 Maj. Harry Edward Comstock, Infantry.
 Maj. William Russell Standiford, Infantry.
 Maj. John Hugh Lewis, Cavalry.
 Maj. Frederick Sion Young, Infantry.
 Maj. Thomas Samuel Moorman, Infantry.
 Maj. Harry Newton Cootes, Cavalry.
 Maj. Charles Haskell Morrow, Infantry.
 Maj. Lorenzo Dow Gasser, Infantry.
 Maj. Brady Green Ruttencutter, Infantry.
 Maj. Jennings Benjamin Wilson, Infantry.
 Maj. William Oury Smith, Infantry.
 Maj. Clarence King La Motte, Infantry, subject to examination required by law, since retired from active service.
 Maj. George Michael Holley, Infantry.
 Maj. Charles Ward Van Way, Cavalry.
 Maj. Wilson Gillham Heaton, Cavalry.
 Maj. Edgar Simon Stayer, Infantry.
 Maj. Charles Henry Errington, Infantry.
 Maj. George Clymer Shaw, Infantry.
 Maj. Charles Ernest Reese, Infantry.
 Maj. Edward Davis, Cavalry.
 Maj. Robert Soutter Knox, Infantry.
 Maj. William Applegate Castle, Infantry.
 Maj. Harry Dexter Blasland, Infantry.
 Maj. Dorsey Cullen, Cavalry.
 Maj. Charles Coane Allen, Infantry.
 Maj. William Jones Kendrick, Cavalry.
 Maj. Edward Harry Andres, Infantry.
 Maj. George Thomas Bowman, Cavalry.
 Maj. Thomas James Rogers, Infantry.
 Maj. John Sherman Fair, Cavalry.
 Maj. Robert Joseph Reaney, Cavalry.
 Maj. George Washington England, Infantry.
 Maj. Sherrard Coleman, Cavalry.
 Maj. Edwin Joseph Nowlen, Infantry.
 Maj. Alvin Coe Voris, Infantry.
 Maj. William Franklin Herringshaw, Cavalry.
 Maj. George Ernest Kump, Infantry.
 Maj. Milo Charles Corey, Infantry.
 Maj. DeWitt Warren Chamberlin, Infantry, since retired from active service.
 Maj. Walter Henry Johnson, Infantry.

Maj. Robert Gedney Rutherford, jr., Infantry.
 Maj. Robert Emmet Grinstead, Infantry.
 Maj. Albert Sidney Williams, Infantry.
 Maj. William Bassett Graham, Infantry.
 Maj. Charles Johnston Nelson, Infantry.
 Maj. Ernest Alexis Jeunet, Infantry.
 Maj. Charles Hart Danforth, Infantry.
 Maj. Gideon Hazen Williams, Infantry.
 Maj. Fred William Bugbee, Infantry.
 Maj. William Munson Goodale, Infantry.
 Maj. Leonard Trabue Baker, Infantry.
 Maj. Franklin Schoch Lensenring, Infantry.
 Maj. Charles Frederick Andrews, Infantry.
 Maj. Allan Lindsay Briggs, Infantry.
 Maj. James Marshall Petty, Infantry.
 Maj. John Brooke Shuman, Infantry.
 Maj. Frederic George Kellond, Infantry.
 Maj. Herbert L. Evans, Infantry.
 Maj. Harry Davis Mitchell, Infantry.
 Maj. Ode Calvin Nichols, Infantry.
 Maj. Kirwin Taylor Smith, Infantry.
 Maj. William Weston Bessell, Infantry.
 Maj. Frank C. Burnett, Infantry.
 Maj. Collin Hankins Ball, Infantry.
 Maj. Albert Owen Seaman, Infantry.
 Maj. Clifford Utley Leonori, Infantry.
 Maj. Benjamin Helm Pope, Infantry.
 Maj. Clarence Gifford Bunker, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. William Howard Tobin, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Harry James Watson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. William Henry Raymond, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Jacob Ellsworth Wyke, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Gouverneur Vernon Packer, Judge Advocate General's Department.
 Maj. Paul Stanley Bond, Corps of Engineers.
 Maj. Joseph Augustus Baer, Cavalry.
 Maj. Charles Fletcher Martin, Cavalry.
 Maj. Willis Virlin Morris, Cavalry.
 Maj. Walter Schuyler Grant, Cavalry.
 Maj. Charles Oswick Zollars, Quartermaster Corps.
 Maj. Robert Bruce McBride, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Jacob Meyer Coward, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. John Lovering Roberts, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Frederick Leroy Buck, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Jay Paul Hopkins, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Archibald Henry Sunderland, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Morton Claire Mumma, Cavalry.
 Maj. Frank Porter Amos, Cavalry.
 Maj. Herman Glade, Infantry.
 Maj. Arthur Penrhyn Stanley Hyde, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Clifford Carleton Carson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Julian Arnold Benjamin, Cavalry.
 Maj. Samuel Reid Gleaves, Cavalry.
 Maj. Frank Sayles Bowen, Infantry.
 Maj. Lewis Sidney Morey, Cavalry.
 Maj. Verne La Salle Rockwell, Cavalry.
 Maj. George Thompson Perkins, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. George Blanchard Comly, Cavalry.
 Maj. Charles Godfrey Harvey, Cavalry.
 Maj. George Brydges Rodney, Cavalry.
 Maj. Alexander Higbee Davidson, Cavalry.
 Maj. Christian Albert Bach, Cavalry.
 Maj. David Harmony Biddle, Cavalry.
 Maj. William Fredric Holford Godson, Cavalry.
 Maj. George William Winterburn, Cavalry.
 Maj. Lewis Foerster, Cavalry.
 Maj. William Porter Moffet, Cavalry.
 Maj. Archibald Francis Commiskey, Cavalry.
 Maj. William Albert Cornell, Cavalry.
 Maj. James Etter Shelley, Cavalry.
 Maj. Ward Dabney, Infantry.
 Maj. Edward Calvert, Cavalry.
 Maj. Paul Myron Goodrich, Infantry.
 Maj. William Wisner Taylor, jr., Infantry.
 Maj. John Burke Murphy, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Bruce Palmer, Cavalry.
 Maj. George Audley Herbst, Infantry.
 Maj. Jairus Alphaeus Moore, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. James Edmond Fehét, Cavalry.
 Maj. Thomas Meredith Hunter, Infantry.
 Maj. Elverton Elmer Fuller, Infantry.
 Maj. William Summerfield Neely, Infantry.
 Maj. Frank Howard Adams, Infantry.
 Maj. George Chase Lewis, Infantry.

Maj. William Henry Patterson, Infantry.
 Maj. Elliott Malloy Norton, Infantry.
 Maj. Roscoe Hugh Hearn, Infantry.
 Maj. Frank Barker Edwards, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Philip Worthington Corbuser, Cavalry.
 Maj. Frederick Marion Jones, Cavalry.
 Capt. John Adam Wagner, Cavalry.
 Capt. Archie Miller, Cavalry.
 Capt. William Hugh Clopton, jr., Cavalry.
 Capt. Wilford Twyman, Infantry.
 Capt. William Oscar Reed, Cavalry.
 Capt. Henry Gibbins, Cavalry.
 Capt. Charles Oscar Thomas, jr., Cavalry.
 Capt. Edmond Ross Tompkins, Cavalry.
 Capt. Arthur Poillon, Cavalry.
 Capt. George Augustus Parington, Cavalry, subject to examination required by law, since retired from active service.
 Capt. George Wesley Biegler, Cavalry.
 Capt. Francis Wiley Glover, Cavalry.
 Capt. Lawrence Scott Carson, Cavalry.
 Capt. Alexander Bacon Cox, Cavalry.
 Capt. Timothy Michael Coughlan, Cavalry.
 Capt. James Huston, Cavalry.
 Capt. Leonard Lyon Deitrick, Cavalry.
 Capt. Richard Billups Going, Cavalry.
 Capt. Hamilton Bowie, Cavalry.
 Capt. Ben Lear, jr., Cavalry.
 Capt. George Parker Tyner, Cavalry.
 Maj. Morris Melville Keck, Infantry.
 Maj. Auswell Edmund Deitsch, Infantry.
 Capt. Henry Joseph McKenney, Cavalry.
 Capt. Oscar Alonzo McGee, Cavalry.
 Capt. Casper Willis Cole, Cavalry.
 Capt. Oliver Perry Morton Hazzard, Cavalry.
 Capt. Frank Thomas McNarney, Cavalry.
 Capt. Thomas MacAllister Knox, Cavalry.
 Capt. William Remsen Taylor, Cavalry.
 Capt. John Patrick Hasson, Cavalry.
 Capt. William Egbert Wheeler MacKinlay, Cavalry.
 Capt. Gordon Johnston, Cavalry.
 Capt. William Allen Austin, Cavalry.
 Capt. Rudolph Ethelbert Smyser, Cavalry.
 Capt. Jens Erickson Stedje, Cavalry.
 Capt. John Ezra Hemphill, Cavalry.
 Capt. Otto William Rethorst, Cavalry.
 Capt. Robert Sterrett, Cavalry.
 Capt. William Bernhard Renziehausen, Cavalry.
 Capt. Emory Scott West, Cavalry.
 Capt. Ralph Carter Caldwell, Cavalry.
 Capt. Eben Swift, jr., Cavalry.
 Capt. Albert Edgar Phillips, Cavalry.
 Capt. John Alden Degen, Cavalry.
 Capt. Alvin St. Clair Perkins, Cavalry.
 Capt. Robert McFarland Barton, Cavalry.
 Capt. Walter Janatt Scott, Cavalry.
 Capt. James Edward Abbott, Cavalry.
 Capt. Roland Beverly Ellis, Cavalry.
 Capt. Selwyn Dyson Smith, Cavalry.
 Capt. George Frederick Bailey, Cavalry.
 Capt. Clarence Curtis Culver, Cavalry.
 Capt. Frederick Goodwin Turner, Cavalry.
 Capt. Frank Burch Edwards, Cavalry.
 Capt. James Perrine Barney, Cavalry.
 Capt. William Columbus Gardenhire, Cavalry.
 Maj. Joseph Cornelius Kay, Infantry.
 Capt. Benjamin Oliver Davis, Cavalry.
 Maj. Walter Chambers Jones, Infantry.
 Maj. George Ross Greene, Field Artillery.
 Maj. LaVergne L. Gregg, Infantry.
 Maj. Gustave Adolphus Wieser, Infantry.
 Maj. Bertram Page Johnson, Infantry.
 Maj. Charles Ridgely White Morison, Infantry.
 Maj. Walter Lawrence Reed, Infantry.
 Maj. Ira Franklin Fravel, Infantry.
 Maj. Ned Merrill Green, Infantry.
 Maj. James Alfred Moss, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Frederick Leonard, Infantry.
 Capt. Franklin Potter Jackson, Infantry.
 Maj. Henry Clay Merriam, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Robert Wilbur Collins, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. William Albert Covington, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. John Mitchell Dunn, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Raymond Westcott Briggs, Field Artillery.
 Maj. Francis Wharton Griffin, Field Artillery.

Maj. Theodore Herman Koch, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. James Laurence Long, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Ralph Molyneux Mitchell, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Frederick Louis Dengler, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Richard Howard Williams, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Lewis Stoddard Ryan, Field Artillery.
 Maj. Kenneth Clyde Masteller, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Tilman Campbell, Field Artillery.
 Maj. Daniel Frank Craig, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Thomas Lilley Sherburne, Cavalry.
 Maj. Joseph Matson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Francis Hicks Lincoln, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. William Henry Wilson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Augustus Bennett Warfield, Quartermaster Corps.
 Maj. Edward Dennis Powers, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Charles Edward Nason Howard, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Howard Lee Landers, Field Artillery.
 Maj. Claudius Milton Seaman, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Hugh John Bedell McElgin, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. William Henry Burt, Field Artillery.
 Maj. Frederick Bernard Hennessy, Field Artillery.
 Maj. Arthur Leonard Fuller, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Henry Rozer Casey, Quartermaster Corps.
 Maj. John Sherman Chambers, Quartermaster Corps.
 Maj. Laurin Leonard Lawson, Field Artillery.
 Maj. Morris Ernest Locke, Field Artillery.
 Maj. John William Kilbreth, Field Artillery.
 Maj. James Regan, Quartermaster Corps.
 Maj. Gilbert McKee Allen, Infantry.
 Maj. John Randolph, Infantry.
 Maj. William Hume Clendenin, Infantry.
 Maj. John Royden Kelly, Field Artillery.
 Maj. Edward Raynsford Warner McCabe, Field Artillery.
 Maj. William Gustin Ball, Quartermaster Corps.
 Maj. Walter Eugene Gunster, Infantry.
 Maj. William Richard Kendrick, Infantry.
 Maj. Horace Fennell Sykes, Infantry.
 Maj. Oliver Prescott Robinson, Infantry.
 Maj. Gerrit Van Schaick Quackenbush, Quartermaster Corps.
 Maj. Sydney Herbert Hopson, Quartermaster Corps.
 Maj. William Eugene Gillmore, Air Service.
 Maj. William Ernest Persons, Infantry.
 Maj. James Gibson Taylor, Infantry.
 Maj. Henry Clay Miller Supplee, Infantry.
 Maj. William Kern Moore, Quartermaster Corps.
 Maj. David Yulee Beckham, Finance Department.
 Maj. John Overton Steger, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Alex McMillan Hall, Infantry.
 Maj. Elliot Caziare, Infantry.
 Maj. Richard Wilde Walker, Cavalry.
 Maj. George Augustus Franklin Trumbo, Cavalry.
 Maj. Carl C. Jones, Quartermaster Corps.
 Maj. Alfred James Booth, Infantry.
 Maj. Emery Tritle Smith, Field Artillery.
 Maj. Sydney Smith, Infantry.
 Maj. Joseph Asa Marmon, Infantry.
 Maj. James Aloysius Higgins, Infantry.
 Maj. Rex Van Den Corput, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. James Augustus Thomas, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. John Christian Ohnstad, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. James Dala Watson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Rinaldo Roscoe Wood, Infantry.
 Maj. Charles Davis Winn, Quartermaster Corps.
 Maj. Francis Herbert Lomax, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. James Totten, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Wesley Wilson Knox Hamilton, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Hugh Screven Brown, Infantry.
 Maj. Sebring Clay Megill, Signal Corps.
 Maj. Harry Graham, Air Service.
 Maj. James Hartz Bryson, Field Artillery.
 Maj. William Barlow Wallace, Infantry.
 Maj. Edward Neele Johnston, Corps of Engineers.
 Maj. Clarence Osborne Sherrill, Corps of Engineers.
 Maj. Ernest Dichmann Peek, Corps of Engineers.
 Maj. George Redfield Spalding, Corps of Engineers.
 Maj. Elliott Johnstone Dent, Corps of Engineers.
 Maj. William Goff Caples, Corps of Engineers.
 Maj. William Provines Stokey, Corps of Engineers.
 Maj. Henry Clay Jewett, Corps of Engineers.
 Maj. Wildurr Willing, Corps of Engineers.
 Maj. Benjamin Hugh Kerfoot, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Roger Owen Mason, Field Artillery.
 Maj. William Stacy Browning, Field Artillery.
 Maj. Francis William Clark, Field Artillery.
 Capt. John Harry Neff, Infantry.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from July 2, 1920.

Maj. Joseph Fauntleroy Barnes, Field Artillery.
 Maj. Walter Driscoll Smith, Field Artillery.
 Maj. William Pierce Ennis, Field Artillery.
 Maj. Harry Birdwhistell Jordan, Ordnance Department.
 Maj. John Taise Sayles, Cavalry.
 Maj. Frank Purdy Lahm, Air Service.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from July 3, 1920.

Maj. Willis Grandy Peace, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Creed Fulton Cox, Field Artillery.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from July 10, 1920.

Maj. Robert McCandless Beck, jr., Cavalry.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from July 11, 1920.

Maj. Dennis Hadley Currie, Field Artillery.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from July 12, 1920.

Maj. Beverly Fielding Browne, Field Artillery.
 Maj. George Moore Russell, Cavalry.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from July 13, 1920.

Maj. Edward Marsh Shinkle, Ordnance Department.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from July 16, 1920.

Maj. Lewis Brown, jr., Cavalry.
 Maj. Raymond Silas Pratt, Field Artillery.
 Maj. Alfred Allen Maybach, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Jerome Gray Pillow, Cavalry.
 Maj. Ralph Noble Hayden, Quartermaster Corps.
 Maj. Alden Farley Brewster, Field Artillery.
 Maj. John Anderson Berry, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Leonard William Prunty, Cavalry.
 Maj. Gordon Robinson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Edward Harrison DeArmond, Field Artillery.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from July 17, 1920.

Maj. Edmund Kearsley Sterling, Cavalry.
 Maj. Kerr Tunis Riggs, Cavalry.
 Maj. Carl Henry Müller, Cavalry.
 Maj. Charles Burnett, Cavalry.
 Maj. Claude Ernest Brigham, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. Walter Herbert Smith, Field Artillery.
 Maj. William Tidball, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Maj. George Hathaway Baird, Cavalry.
 Maj. William Manley Cooley, Cavalry.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from July 18, 1920.

Maj. William Nafew Haskell, Cavalry.
 Maj. James Prentice, Coast Artillery Corps.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from July 19, 1920.

Maj. Henry Adolphus Meyer, jr., Cavalry.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from July 20, 1920.

Maj. Frank Keller, Cavalry.
 Maj. Guy Kent, Cavalry.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from July 24, 1920.

Maj. Copley Enos, Cavalry.
 Maj. Norton Ellsworth Wood, Quartermaster Corps.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from July 28, 1920.

Maj. Shepard Lawrence Pike, Infantry.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from July 29, 1920.

Maj. George Aloysius Wiczorek, Coast Artillery Corps.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from August 1, 1920.

Maj. Marion Somerville Battle, Coast Artillery Corps.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from August 6, 1920.

Maj. Henry Gilmore Stahl, Infantry.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from August 8, 1920.

Maj. Roy Carrington Kirtland, Air Service.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from August 17, 1920.

Maj. Ernest Stephen Wheeler, Quartermaster Corps.
 Maj. Stanley Symmes Ross, Finance Department.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from August 22, 1920.

Maj. Wallace McNamara, Infantry.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from September 1, 1920.

Maj. Frederick Mears, Corps of Engineers, subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Alden Max Graham, Quartermaster Corps.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from September 3, 1920.

Maj. Robert LeRoy Collins, Cavalry.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from September 5, 1920.

Maj. Irvin Lee Hunsaker, Cavalry.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from September 10, 1920.
 Maj. Clifton Ranney Norton, Cavalry.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from September 15, 1920.
 Maj. Eugene Julius Ely, Finance Department.
 Maj. Charles Russell Mayo, Cavalry.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from September 17, 1920.
 Maj. Arthur James Lynch, Quartermaster Corps.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from September 21, 1920.
 Maj. Guy Eugene Bucker, Infantry.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from September 22, 1920.
 Maj. Albert Stanley Fuger, Field Artillery.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from September 28, 1920.
 Maj. Rawson Warren, Cavalry.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from October 5, 1920.
 Maj. John Henry Read, jr., Ordnance Department.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from October 8, 1920.
 Maj. Robert Gray Peck, Infantry.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from October 13, 1920.
 Maj. Robert John Binford, Infantry.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from October 17, 1920.
 Maj. John Augustus Brockman, Infantry.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from October 19, 1920.
 Maj. Charles Conaway Burt, Coast Artillery Corps.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from October 24, 1920.
 Maj. Sheldon Webb Anding, Infantry.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from October 28, 1920.
 Maj. William Gaither Murchison, Infantry.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from November 1, 1920.
 Maj. Joseph Howard Barnard, Quartermaster Corps.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from November 3, 1920.
 Maj. Rodman Butler, Quartermaster Corps.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from November 10, 1920.
 Maj. Howard Stanley Miller, Coast Artillery Corps.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from November 13, 1920.
 Maj. Clarence Lininger, Cavalry.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from November 14, 1920.
 Maj. Edward Murray Offley, Cavalry.
 Maj. John Cocke, Cavalry.
 Maj. Elvin Henry Wagner, Infantry.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from November 16, 1920.
 Maj. John Thomas Donnelly, Cavalry.
 Maj. William Henry Menges, Finance Department.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from November 17, 1920.
 Maj. Ronald Earle Fisher, Cavalry.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from November 18, 1920.
 Maj. Thomas Watson Brown, Infantry.
 Maj. Otis Robert Cole, Infantry.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from November 19, 1920.
 Maj. Charles Emery Hathaway, Cavalry.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from November 24, 1920.
 Maj. Joseph Victor Kuznik, Cavalry.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from November 25, 1920.
 Maj. Edward Raymond Coppock, Cavalry.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from November 26, 1920.
 Maj. Shelby Carl Leasure, Infantry.
 Maj. Peter John Hennessey, Cavalry, to be lieutenant colonel with rank from December 14, 1920.
 Maj. Kenyon Ashe Joyce, Cavalry, to be lieutenant colonel with rank from December 16, 1920.
 Maj. Charles Frederick Herr, Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel with rank from December 19, 1920.
 Maj. Francis Joseph Behr, Coast Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant colonel with rank from December 21, 1920.
 Maj. Fred Hays Turner, Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel with rank from December 22, 1920.
 Maj. Howard Carlyle Tatum, Cavalry, to be lieutenant colonel with rank from December 23, 1920.
 Maj. Arthur George Fisher, Cavalry, to be lieutenant colonel with rank from December 25, 1920.

To be majors with rank from July 1, 1920.
 Capt. John Sherman Chambers, Infantry.
 Capt. James Regan, Infantry.
 Capt. Gilbert McKee Allen, Infantry.
 Capt. John Randolph, Infantry.

Capt. William Hume Clendenin, Infantry.
 Capt. Edward Raynsford Warner McCabe, Field Artillery.
 Capt. William Gustin Ball, Infantry.
 Capt. Walter Eugene Gunster, Infantry.
 Capt. William Richard Kendrick, Infantry.
 Capt. Horace Fennell Sykes, Infantry.
 Capt. Oliver Prescott Robinson, Infantry.
 Capt. Gerrit Van Schaick Quackenbush, Infantry.
 Capt. Sydney Herbert Hopson, Infantry.
 Capt. William Eugene Gillmore, Infantry.
 Capt. William Ernest Persons, Infantry.
 Capt. James Gibson Taylor, Infantry.
 Capt. Henry Clay Miller Supplee, Infantry.
 Capt. John Overton Steger, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Alex McMillan Hall, Infantry.
 Capt. Elliot Caziarc, Infantry, since retired from active service.

Capt. Richard Wilde Walker, Cavalry.
 Capt. George Augustus Franklin Trumbo, Cavalry.
 Capt. Carl C. Jones, Infantry.
 Capt. Alfred James Booth, Infantry.
 Capt. Sydney Smith, Infantry.
 Capt. Joseph Asa Marmon, Infantry.
 Capt. James Aloysius Higgins, Infantry.
 Capt. Rex Van Den Corput, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. James Augustus Thomas, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. John Christian Olmstead, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. James Dala Watson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Rinaldo Roscoe Wood, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Davis Winn, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Francis Herbert Lomax, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. James Totten, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Wesley Wilson Knox Hamilton, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Hugh Screven Brown, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Sebring Clay Megill, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Harry Graham, Infantry.
 Capt. William Barlow Wallace, Infantry.
 Capt. Benjamin Hugh Kerfoot, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Francis William Clark, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Harry Birdwhistell Jordan, Cavalry.
 Capt. John Taise Sayles, Cavalry.
 Capt. Frank Purdy Lahm, Cavalry.
 Capt. Willis Grandy Peace, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Robert McCandless Beck, jr., Cavalry.
 Capt. George Moore Russell, Cavalry.
 Capt. Edward Marsh Shinkle, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Lewis Brown, jr., Cavalry.
 Capt. Alfred Allen Maybach, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Jerome Gray Pillow, Cavalry.
 Capt. Ralph Noble Hayden, Cavalry.
 Capt. John Anderson Berry, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Leonard William Prunty, Cavalry.
 Capt. Gordon Robinson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Edmund Kearsley Sterling, Cavalry.
 Capt. Kerr Tunis Riggs, Cavalry.
 Capt. Carl Henry Müller, Cavalry.
 Capt. Charles Burnett, Cavalry.
 Capt. Claude Ernest Brigham, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. William Tidball, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. George Hathaway Baird, Cavalry.
 Capt. William Manley Cooley, Cavalry.
 Capt. William Nafew Haskell, Cavalry.
 Capt. James Prentice, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Henry Adolphus Meyer, jr., Cavalry.
 Capt. Frank Keller, Cavalry.
 Capt. Guy Kent, Cavalry.
 Capt. Copley Enos, Cavalry.
 Capt. Shepard Lawrence Pike, Infantry.
 Capt. George Aloysius Wiczorek, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Marion Somerville Battle, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Henry Gilmore Stahl, Infantry.
 Capt. Roy Carrington Kirtland, Infantry.
 Capt. Stanley Symmes Ross, Finance Department.
 Capt. Wallace McNamara, Infantry.
 Capt. Frederick Mears, Cavalry, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Alden Max Graham, Cavalry.
 Capt. Robert LeRoy Collins, Cavalry.
 Capt. Irvin Lee Hunsaker, Cavalry.
 Capt. Clifton Ranney Norton, Cavalry.
 Capt. Eugene Julius Ely, Cavalry.
 Capt. Charles Russell Mayo, Cavalry.
 Capt. Arthur James Lynch, Cavalry.
 Capt. Guy Eugene Bucker, Infantry.
 Capt. Rawson Warren, Cavalry.
 Capt. John Henry Read, jr., Cavalry.

Capt. Robert Gray Peck, Infantry.
 Capt. Robert John Binford, Infantry.
 Capt. John Augustus Brockman, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Conaway Burt, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Sheldon Webb Anding, Infantry.
 Capt. William Gaither Murchison, Infantry.
 Capt. Joseph Howard Barnard, Cavalry.
 Capt. Rodman Butler, Cavalry.
 Capt. Howard Stanley Miller, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Clarence Lininger, Cavalry.
 Capt. Edward Murray Offley, Cavalry.
 Capt. John Cocke, Cavalry.
 Capt. Elvin Henry Wagner, Infantry.
 Capt. John Thomas Donnelly, Cavalry.
 Capt. William Henry Menges, Finance Department.
 Capt. Ronald Earle Fisher, Cavalry.
 Capt. Thomas Watson Brown, Infantry.
 Capt. Otis Robert Cole, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Emery Hathaway, Cavalry.
 Capt. Joseph Victor Kuznik, Cavalry.
 Capt. Edward Raymond Coppock, Cavalry.
 Capt. Shelby Carl Leasure, Infantry.
 Capt. Peter John Hennessey, Cavalry.
 Capt. Kenyon Ashe Joyce, Cavalry.
 Capt. Charles Frederick Herr, Infantry.
 Capt. Francis Joseph Behr, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Fred Hays Turner, Infantry.
 Capt. Howard Carlyle Tatum, Cavalry.
 Capt. Arthur George Fisher, Cavalry.
 Capt. Walter Krueger, Infantry.
 Capt. Asa Leon Singleton, Infantry.
 Capt. Arthur LeRoy Bump, Infantry.
 Capt. Willis Edward Mills, Infantry.
 Capt. George Grunert, Cavalry.
 Capt. Harry Westervelt Gregg, Infantry.
 Capt. William Rivers Pope, Cavalry.
 Capt. Staley Alfred Campbell, Infantry.
 Capt. John Rowe Brewer, Infantry.
 Capt. Olney Place, Cavalry.
 Capt. Leo Asa Dewey, Infantry.
 Capt. John Pope McAdams, Infantry.
 Capt. Thomas Hood Cunningham, Cavalry.
 Capt. John Robert Musgrave, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Sidney Derby Maize, Cavalry.
 Capt. Richard Wetherill, Infantry.
 Capt. Hartman Lewis Butler, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. John Bryson Barnes, Infantry.
 Capt. Thomas Taylor Duke, Infantry.
 Capt. Harry Arthur Wells, Infantry.
 Capt. Ralph Middleton Parker, Cavalry.
 Capt. George Warren Harris, Infantry.
 Capt. Edward Gregg McCleave, Infantry.
 Capt. Pat M. Stevens, Infantry.
 Capt. William Holt Peek, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. George Steele Gillis, Infantry.
 Capt. John Hastings Howard, Cavalry.
 Capt. John Joshua Fulmer, Infantry.
 Capt. Joseph Irving McMullen, Cavalry.
 Capt. Matt Combes Bristol, Cavalry.
 Capt. Kelton Lyon Pepper, Infantry.
 Capt. Francis Cassius Endicott, Infantry.
 Capt. Horace Nathaniel Munro, Cavalry.
 Capt. Thomas Pitcher Bernard, Cavalry.
 Capt. Daniel D. Thompkins, Cavalry.
 Capt. Clarence Anderson Dougherty, Cavalry.
 Capt. Henry Hossfeld, Infantry.
 Capt. John Jay Mudgett, Infantry.
 Capt. Isaac Samuel Martin, Cavalry.
 Capt. Channing Edmonds Delaplane, Infantry.
 Capt. Laurance Oldham Mathews, Infantry.
 Capt. George R. Somerville, Cavalry.
 Capt. Seth William Cook, Cavalry.
 Capt. Milton Garfield Holliday, Cavalry.
 Capt. Robert Rogers Love, Cavalry.
 Capt. Thorne Strayer, Infantry.
 Capt. Francis Buck Eastman, Infantry.
 Capt. Kneeland Sparrow Snow, Infantry.
 Capt. Robert Gaither Caldwell, Infantry.
 Capt. Hugh Almer Parker, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Wesley Tillotson, Infantry.
 Capt. Will Dunbar Wills, Infantry.
 Capt. William Conrad Stoll, Infantry.
 Capt. Ira Austin Smith, Infantry.
 Capt. James Edwin Ware, Infantry.
 Capt. James Eveleth Wilson, Coast Artillery Corps.

Capt. William James Davis, Infantry.
 Capt. John Fleming Clapham, Infantry.
 Capt. William Arden Alfante, Infantry.
 Capt. Daniel Andrew Nolan, Infantry.
 Capt. Walter Herbert Neill, Cavalry.
 Capt. Edmund Anthony Buchanan, Cavalry.
 Capt. Benjamin Delahaut Foulis, Infantry.
 Capt. Roy Wilson Ashbrook, Infantry.
 Capt. Ralph Hill Leavitt, Infantry.
 Capt. Goodwin Compton, Infantry.
 Capt. Launcelot Marmaduke Purcell, Infantry.
 Capt. James Edmund McDonald, Infantry.
 Capt. Carl Frederick von dem Bussche, Infantry.
 Capt. Albert Louis Rhoades, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Sam Pruitt Herren, Infantry.
 Capt. Fay Warrington Brabson, Infantry.
 Capt. Royden Eugene Beebe, Infantry.
 Capt. Edward Appleton Keyes, Cavalry.
 Capt. John Gano Winter, Cavalry.
 Capt. William James O'Loughlin, Infantry.
 Capt. Herbert Edward Mann, Cavalry.
 Capt. Orlando Gray Palmer, Cavalry.
 Capt. Francis Augustus Ruggles, Cavalry.
 Capt. Henry Tilghman Bull, Cavalry.
 Capt. Girard Lindsley McEntee, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Keller, Infantry.
 Capt. Howard Russell Smalley, Cavalry.
 Capt. John Scott, Infantry.
 Capt. Smith Aaron Harris, Infantry.
 Capt. Noble James Wiley, Infantry.
 Capt. James Pryor Castleman, Cavalry.
 Capt. George Catlett Marshall, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. Talbot Smith, Cavalry.
 Capt. Frank Edwin Davis, Cavalry.
 Capt. William Wallace Overton, Cavalry.
 Capt. Samuel Turner Mackall, Infantry.
 Capt. Walter Campbell Short, Infantry.
 Capt. Austin Myron Pardee, Infantry.
 Capt. Frank Fanning Jewett, Infantry.
 Capt. William Frederick Christian Jepson, Infantry.
 Capt. Augustus Francis Dannemiller, Infantry.
 Capt. Alfred Asa Hickox, Infantry.
 Capt. Samuel Greaner Talbot, Infantry.
 Capt. John Ernest Green, Infantry.
 Capt. Jason Marion Walling, Infantry.
 Capt. William Elmer Murray, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Norris Stayton, Quartermaster Corps.
 Capt. George Allen Taylor, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Ralph Emerson Herring, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Houston Bales Parrott, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Glen Fay Jenks, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Edmund Turner Weisel, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Clarence Beaumont Ross, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Richard Henry Jordan, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. William Storrs Bowen, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. James Brewster Taylor, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Brainerd Taylor, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Emmet Roland Harris, Cavalry.
 Capt. Avery John Cooper, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Frank Geere, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. George Leftwich Wertenbaker, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Walter Campbell Baker, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. George Percy Hawes, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Richard Irving McKenney, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. John Victor Spring, jr., Cavalry.
 Capt. Charles Albert Clark, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Frank Charles Wood, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry.
 Capt. Aristides Moreno, Infantry.
 Capt. William Lay Patterson, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Edward Wheatley, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Crispulo Pataje, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. William Paterson, Coast Artillery Corps, since retired from active service.
 Capt. Earl Briscoe, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Charles Almon Hunt, Infantry.
 Capt. Gilbert Henry Stewart, Infantry.
 Capt. Wade Hampton Carpenter, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Adam Floy Casad, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. John Epps Munroe, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. John Cargill Pegram, Cavalry.
 Capt. Harry Lumsden Hodges, Cavalry.
 Capt. Edward Jay Moran, Infantry.
 Capt. Victor Sidney Foster, Cavalry.
 Capt. Walter King Wilson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. John Preston Terrell, Coast Artillery Corps.

- Capt. Myron Sidney Crissy, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Oscar Foley, Cavalry.
 Capt. Frederick Dudley Griffith, jr., Cavalry.
 Capt. Albert Bowdre Dockery, Cavalry.
 Capt. Henry Edmestoune Mitchell, Cavalry.
 Capt. Charles McHenry Eby, Cavalry.
 Capt. William Henry Cowles, Cavalry.
 Capt. Henry Meredith Nelly, Infantry.
 Capt. Frederick Frasier Black, Infantry.
 Capt. William Alexander McCain, Cavalry.
 Capt. John Knowles Herr, Cavalry.
 Capt. Joseph Fulton Taulbee, Cavalry.
 Capt. James Marcellus Hobson, jr., Infantry, subject to examination required by law.
 Capt. David Henry Bower, Infantry.
 Capt. Hiram Marshal Cooper, Infantry.
 Capt. Troup Miller, Cavalry.
 Capt. Benjamin Franklin Miller, Infantry.
 Capt. William Waller Edwards, Cavalry.
 Capt. John Alexander Barry, Cavalry.
 Capt. William Whitelaw Gordon, Cavalry.
 Capt. Frank Leslie Pyle, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Walter Osgood Boswell, Infantry.
 Capt. Harold Burgess Johnson, Cavalry.
 Capt. Malcolm Peters Andruss, Coast Artillery.
 Capt. Gullelmus Villard Heidt, Infantry.
 Capt. Albert Hecker Mueller, Cavalry.
 Capt. Samuel James Sutherland, Infantry.
 Capt. Franc Lecocq, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Emory Sherwood Adams, Infantry.
 Capt. Ralph Willard Drury, Infantry.
 Capt. John Carlyle Fairfax, Infantry.
 Capt. Fred Charles Miller, Infantry.
 Capt. Walter Joseph Büttgenbach, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Allan Francis McLean, Cavalry.
 Capt. Charles Leslie Mitchell, Infantry.
 Capt. Robert John West, Infantry.
 Capt. Herman Stahlschmidt Dilworth, Cavalry.
 Capt. Odiorne Hawks Sampson, Infantry.
 Capt. Albert Hardman, Infantry.
 Capt. Frank Blair Kobes, Cavalry.
 Capt. Norman Harry Davis, Cavalry.
 Capt. Hans Oscar Olson, Infantry.
 Capt. Alfred Brandt, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Augustine Thuis, Infantry.
 Capt. Claremont Aymar Donaldson, Infantry.
 Capt. Franklin Thomas Burt, Infantry.
 Capt. Townsend Whelen, Infantry.
 Capt. Samuel Sumner Bryant, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Smith Hamilton, Infantry.
 Capt. John Speed Davis, Infantry, since retired from active service.
 Capt. Oscar Kemp Tolley, Infantry.
 Capt. Joseph Fulton Ware, Infantry.
 Capt. Harry Lightfoot Jordan, Infantry.
 Capt. Dean Halford, Infantry.
 Capt. Ralph Willcox Kingman, Infantry.
 Capt. Donald Davie Hay, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.
 Capt. George Watkins Ewell, Infantry.
 Capt. Claire Raymond Bennett, Infantry.
 Capt. Bowers Davis, Infantry.
 Capt. John McEwen Pruyn, Infantry.
 Capt. Henry Wyatt Fleet, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Gates Sturtevant, Infantry.
 Capt. Francis Henry Burr, Infantry.
 Capt. John Chowning Ashburn, Infantry.
 Capt. Robert Truman Phinney, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Edward Terry Lull, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Charles Haynes Mason, Infantry.
 Capt. Nicholas William Campanole, Infantry.
 Capt. John Gordon Macomb, Infantry.
 Capt. Lewis Worthington Moseley, Infantry.
 Capt. Walter William Merrill, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Reginald Heber Kelley, Infantry.
 Capt. Claude Newman Feamster, Infantry.
 Capt. Joseph Oswald Mauborgne, Infantry.
 Capt. Joseph Michael Cummins, Infantry.
 Capt. Thomas Ceburn Musgrave, Infantry.
 Capt. Converse Rising Lewis, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Telford, Cavalry.
 Capt. Levi Galloway Brown, Cavalry.
 Capt. Owen Glenn Collins, Quartermaster Corps.
 Capt. Frederic Harrison Smith, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Olan Cecil Aleshire, Cavalry.
 Capt. Frederick Ernest Shnyder, Cavalry.
 Capt. George Arthur Lynch, Infantry.
 Capt. George Wilbur Cocheu, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Charles Herman Patterson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Lewis Turtle, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Clifford Jones, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Louis Cass Brinton, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Thomas Fraley Van Natta, jr., Cavalry.
 Capt. James Andrew Mars, Cavalry.
 Capt. Quinn Gray, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Robert Morgan Lyon, Infantry.
 Capt. John Carter Montgomery, Cavalry.
 Capt. Louis Robinson Dice, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. William Mechling Colvin, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Francis Hamilton Farnum, Infantry.
 Capt. Benjamin Edwards Grey, Infantry.
 Capt. Elvid Hunt, Infantry.
 Capt. Dorsey Read Rodney, Cavalry.
 Capt. Alexander Mortimer Milton, Cavalry.
 Capt. Francis Maurice Hinkle, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Benjamin Franklin McClellan, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.
 Capt. Campbell Blackshear Hodges, Infantry.
 Capt. Jacob Winfield Scott Wuest, Infantry.
 Capt. Max Bruce Garber, Infantry.
 Capt. Corbit Strickland Hoffman, Infantry.
 Capt. Stephen Wilson Winfree, Cavalry.
 Capt. Ephriam Foster Graham, Cavalry.
 Capt. George Francis Rozelle, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. Arthur Emmett Ahrends, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Franklin Severson, Infantry.
 Capt. Harry Surgisson Grier, Infantry.
 Capt. Reuben Chapman Taylor, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Beatty Moore, Infantry.
 Capt. Clark Lynn, Infantry.
 Capt. Cornelius Stockmar Bendel, Infantry.
 Capt. Ben Frazer Ristine, Infantry.
 Capt. Albert Gilmor, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Stuart Ainslee Howard, Infantry.
 Capt. John Francis Franklin, Infantry.
 Capt. William Cissna Russell, Infantry.
 Capt. Roland Wallace Boughton, Infantry.
 Capt. John Southworth Upham, Infantry.
 Capt. Irving Monroe Madison, Infantry.
 Capt. Ellery Farmer, Infantry.
 Capt. Everett Newton Bowman, Infantry.
 Capt. Homer Neill Preston, Infantry.
 Capt. Jesse Gaston, Infantry.
 Capt. Edward Aloysius Brown, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. William Franklin Harrell, Infantry.
 Capt. George Edgar Nelson, Cavalry.
 Capt. Jesse Duncan Elliott, Infantry.
 Capt. Edward Himmelwright Tarbutton, Infantry.
 Capt. Carroll Borden Hodges, Infantry.
 Capt. Daniel Murray Cheston, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. James Madison Churchill, Infantry.
 Capt. Philip Haxall Bagby, Infantry.
 Capt. Luther Rice James, Infantry.
 Capt. Andrew Davis Chaffin, Infantry.
 Capt. Frederick Wegener Boschen, Infantry.
 Capt. Emil Engel, Cavalry.
 Capt. Louis Farrell, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Otto Schudt, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Emmett Addis, Cavalry.
 Capt. Harry Lazelle King, Cavalry.
 Capt. William Franklin Robinson, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. John James Burleigh, Infantry.
 Capt. Arthur Gerald Hixon, Cavalry.
 Capt. Augustine Aloysius Hofmann, Infantry.
 Capt. James Blyth, Infantry.
 Capt. Edwin Gunner, Infantry.
 Capt. Resolve Potter Palmer, Infantry.
 Capt. Edward Eugene McCammon, Infantry.
 Capt. Philip Remington, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Henry Rich, Infantry.
 Capt. Paul Calkins Potter, Infantry.
 Capt. Albert Thurston Rich, Infantry.
 Capt. David Perry Wood, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Bean Amory, jr., Cavalry.
 Capt. Walton Goodwin, jr., Cavalry.
 Capt. Phillip Bradley Peyton, Infantry.
 Capt. Karl Truesdell, Infantry.
 Capt. Frederick Brahan Terrell, Infantry.
 Capt. Mark Lorin Ireland, Coast Artillery Corps.

Capt. Charles Avery Dravo, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Russell Alley, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. James Garfield McIlroy, Infantry.
 Capt. Vaughn Washington Cooper, Cavalry.
 Capt. Chauncey Lee Fenton, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Lucian Barclay Moody, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Paul Delmont Bunker, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Donald Cowan McDonald, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Fulton Quintus Cincinnatus Gardner, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Robert Charlwood Richardson, jr., Cavalry.
 Capt. Robert Madison Campbell, Cavalry.
 Capt. Jay Leland Benedict, Infantry.
 Capt. Philip Henry Worcester, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Charles Thomas Smart, Infantry.
 Capt. George Bowditch Hunter, Cavalry.
 Capt. Joseph Warren Stilwell, Infantry.
 Capt. James Kerr Crain, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Carr Wilson Waller, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Richard James Herman, Infantry.
 Capt. David McCandless McKell, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Matthew Arthur Cross, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Henning Ferdinand Colley, Coast Artillery Corps, since retired from active service.
 Capt. Edward Lorenzo Hooper, Infantry.
 Capt. Albert Howell Barkley, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Stanley Koch, Cavalry.
 Capt. Irving Joseph Phillipson, Infantry.
 Capt. Edmund Bristol Gregory, Infantry.
 Capt. Wilber Alexander Blain, Infantry.
 Capt. Walter Singles, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Stephen Clark Reynolds, Cavalry.
 Capt. William Vaulx Carter, Cavalry.
 Capt. Gordon Rives Catts, Infantry.
 Capt. Henry Conger Pratt, Cavalry.
 Capt. Ursa Milner Diller, Infantry.
 Capt. Rollo Fred Anderson, Coast Artillery Corps, since retired from active service.
 Capt. Edwin Butcher, Infantry.
 Capt. Russell Vernon Venable, Infantry.
 Capt. Arthur James Davis, Infantry.
 Capt. Kinzie Bates Edmunds, Cavalry.
 Capt. Martin Christian Wise, Infantry.
 Capt. Andrew Jackson White, Infantry.
 Capt. Walter Scott Drysdale, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.
 Capt. Edward Ellis Farnsworth, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Charles Andrew Meals, Infantry.
 Capt. Matthew Henry Thomlinson, Infantry.
 Capt. Joseph Alexander Atkins, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Fullington Thompson, Infantry.
 Capt. Augustus Bissell Van Wormer, Infantry.
 Capt. Thomas Leslie Crystal, Infantry.
 Capt. James Joseph O'Hara, Cavalry.
 Capt. Albert Courtney Wimberly, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Arthur Dryhurst Budd, Infantry.
 Capt. Ralph Rigby Glass, Infantry.
 Capt. Erle Martin Wilson, Infantry.
 Capt. Merrill Ellicott Spalding, Infantry.
 Capt. Joseph James Grace, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Ray Weber Holderness, Cavalry.
 Capt. John Donald Burnett, Infantry.
 Capt. Joseph Alexander McAndrew, Infantry.
 Capt. Richard Rembert Pickering, Infantry.
 Capt. Lowe Abeel McClure, Infantry.
 Capt. James Scott Greene, Cavalry.
 Capt. Gerald Clark Brant, Cavalry.
 Capt. Clement Hale Wright, Infantry.
 Capt. William Ross Scott, Infantry.
 Capt. William Washington Harris, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. Napoleon William Riley, Infantry.
 Capt. Otto Ludwick Brunzell, Field Artillery.
 Capt. George Carson Lawrason, Cavalry.
 Capt. Robert Pattison Harbold, Infantry.
 Capt. James Barton Woolnough, Infantry.
 Capt. Innis Palmer Swift, Cavalry.
 Capt. Arthur Harrison Wilson, Cavalry.
 Capt. Walter Scott Fulton, Infantry.
 Capt. Sherburne Whipple, Infantry.
 Capt. Harry Hawley, Infantry.
 Capt. Thomas Norton Gimperling, Infantry.
 Capt. Hugh Lawson Walthall, Infantry.
 Capt. John Buchanan Richardson, Infantry.
 Capt. Anton Caesar Cron, Infantry.

Capt. Jaime Nadal, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry.
 Capt. Oscar Winslow Hoop, Infantry.
 Capt. John Clark Moore, Infantry.
 Capt. William Frederick Pearson, Infantry.
 Capt. James Alexander Ulio, Infantry.
 Capt. Frank Moorman, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Harry Harrison Bissell, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Bernadou Elliott, Infantry.
 Capt. John Bunyan Corbly, Infantry.
 Capt. Joseph Lybrand Topham, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Lewis Sampson, Infantry.
 Capt. John Marshall True, Infantry.
 Capt. Bruce Robinson Campbell, Infantry.
 Capt. John Charles French, Infantry.
 Capt. Benjamin Banatt McCroskey, Infantry.
 Capt. John Walter Downer, Field Artillery.
 Capt. James Hatch Van Horn, Infantry.
 Capt. Albert Benjamin Kaempfer, Infantry.
 Capt. Forrest Elmer Overholser, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Winder Mason, Infantry.
 Capt. Loren Chester Grieves, Infantry.
 Capt. Henry Carlos Rexach, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry.
 Capt. Eduardo Iriarte, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry.
 Capt. William Thomas Carpenter, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Teofilo Marxuach, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry.
 Capt. Clifton Monroe Spears, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Benjamin Mart Bailey, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Frank Huntington Phipps, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Thomas Duncan, Air Service.
 Capt. William Perkins Currier, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Ambrose Robert Emery, Infantry.
 Capt. Edmund Clivious Waddill, Infantry.
 Capt. Allen Samuel Fletcher, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Thomas Marshall Spaulding, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Rolland Webster Case, Infantry.
 Capt. Norman Foster Ramsey, Infantry.
 Capt. Benjamin Henderson Lorne Williams, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. LeRoy Bartlett, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Robert Collins Eddy, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. George Dillman, Cavalry.
 Capt. DeWitt Clinton Tucker Grubbs, Infantry.
 Capt. James Frederick Walker, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Thomas West Hammond, Infantry.
 Capt. Ellery Willis Niles, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Calvin Pearl Titus, Infantry.
 Capt. Philip John Radcliffe Kiehl, Cavalry.
 Capt. Adelno Gibson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. John Lee Holcombe, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Charles Lewis Scott, Cavalry.
 Capt. James Saye Duesenbury, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Lloyd Burns Magruder, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Robert Henry Lewis, Field Artillery.
 Capt. William Charles Miller, Infantry.
 Capt. Sidney Howland Guthrie, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Ralph Talbot, jr., Cavalry.
 Capt. William Nicholas Hensley, jr., Cavalry.
 Capt. Arthur Willis Lane, Infantry.
 Capt. Henry Tacitus Burgin, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Nathan Horowitz, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Bernard Lentz, Infantry.
 Capt. Clifford Lee Corbin, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Berkeley Thorne Merchant, Cavalry.
 Capt. Frederick Coleman Test, Infantry.
 Capt. Owen Stedman Albright, Infantry.
 Capt. Fred Hendrickson Baird, Infantry.
 Capt. Hugh Hunt Broadhurst, Cavalry.
 Capt. Clifford Cabell Early, Infantry.
 Capt. Arthur William Holderness, Cavalry.
 Capt. George Frank Waugh, Infantry.
 Capt. Louis Albert O'Donnell, Cavalry.
 Capt. Allan Rutherford, Infantry.
 Capt. Joseph Ray Davis, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Oscar Arden Russell, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Avery Duane Cummings, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Smith Caffery, Infantry.
 Capt. Louis Albert Kunzig, Infantry.
 Capt. John Pearson Bubb, Infantry.
 Capt. Clarence Andrew Mitchell, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. John Roy Starkey, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Joseph Edward Barzynski, Infantry.
 Capt. Ralph Dwight Bates, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Ben Waller Feild, Infantry.
 Capt. Bloxham Ward, Infantry.

Capt. Paul Hedrick Clark, Infantry.
 Capt. Thomas Hixon Lowe, Infantry.
 Capt. Torrey Borden Maghee, Infantry.
 Capt. William Whitehead West, jr., Cavalry.
 Capt. George Washington Maddox, Infantry.
 Capt. Walter Eldridge Pridgen, Infantry.
 Capt. James Wilson Hemphill Reisinger, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. Rupert Algernon Dunford, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Carr Bankhead, Infantry.
 Capt. Michael E. Sliney, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Fred Damman, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. William Greene Carter, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Henry Roland Smalley, Cavalry.
 Capt. Edward Joseph Cullen, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Ira Longanecker, Infantry.
 Capt. William Robert McCleary, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Robert Blaine, Cavalry.
 Capt. Frederick Julius Ostermann, Infantry.
 Capt. William James Connolly, Infantry.
 Capt. Everett Darius Barlow, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. Lawrence Edward Hohl, Infantry.
 Capt. James Griffin Boswell, Infantry, since retired from active service.
 Capt. James Macdonald Lockett, Infantry.
 Capt. Felix Emmanuelli, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry.
 Capt. Pascual Lopez, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry.
 Capt. Daniel Rodriguez, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry.
 Capt. George Harry Wright, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Richard Coke Burleson, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Lloyd Patzloff Horsfall, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Charles Gearhart Mettler, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Charles Bhaer Gatewood, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Joseph Halley Pelot, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Morgan Lewis Brett, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Forrest Estey Williford, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Earl McFarland, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Joseph Andrew Green, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Alexander Garland Pendleton, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Jonathan Mayhew Wainwright, Cavalry.
 Capt. John Cleves Henderson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Charles Alexander Lewis, Infantry.
 Capt. Adna Romanza Chaffee, Cavalry.
 Capt. Edward White Wildrick, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Paul Revere Manchester, Infantry.
 Capt. Alexander Garfield Gillespie, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Dawson Olmstead, Finance Department.
 Capt. Byard Sneed, Infantry.
 Capt. George Williamson DeArmond, Cavalry.
 Capt. John George Quekemeyer, Cavalry.
 Capt. Frank Maxwell Andrews, Cavalry.
 Capt. Oscar Westover, Infantry.
 Capt. John Sedgwick Pratt, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Joseph Choate King, Cavalry.
 Capt. Martyn Hall Shute, Infantry.
 Capt. George Gordon Bartlett, Infantry.
 Capt. Henry Black Clagett, Infantry.
 Capt. Clyde Rush Abraham, Infantry.
 Capt. Pierre Victor Kieffer, Field Artillery.
 Capt. George Harris Paine, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Donald Allister Robinson, Cavalry.
 Capt. Rene Edward de Russey Hoyle, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Philip Mathews, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Richard Herbert Jacob, Infantry.
 Capt. Ralph Allen Jones, Infantry.
 Capt. Horace Fletcher Spurgin, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Hugo D. Selton, Infantry.
 Capt. Max Akin Elser, Infantry.
 Capt. George Rivers Byrd, Infantry.
 Capt. William Torbert MacMillan, Infantry.
 Capt. Eston Murray Barker, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Jacob Earl Fickel, Infantry.
 Capt. Jesse Wright Boyd, Infantry.
 Capt. Ebenezer George Beuret, Infantry.
 Capt. Bruce La Mar Burch, Cavalry.
 Capt. Rush Blodgett Lincoln, Infantry.
 Capt. Edgar Mason Whiting, Cavalry.
 Capt. William Fletcher Sharp, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Walter Francis Llewellyn Hartigan, Infantry.
 Capt. Bruce Magruder, Infantry.
 Capt. George Herman Huddleson, Infantry.
 Capt. Edward Goff Elliott, Cavalry.
 Capt. Guy Herbert Wyman, Cavalry.
 Capt. Verne Raymond Bell, Cavalry.
 Capt. Henry Welles Baird, Cavalry.
 Capt. Harry Hall Pritchett, Infantry.
 Capt. Alexander Hamilton Jones, Cavalry.
 Capt. Edgar Lee Field, Infantry.
 Capt. Jere Baxter, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Louis Stevenson, Cavalry.
 Capt. Frank Kirby Chapin, Cavalry.
 Capt. Lloyd Ralston Fredendall, Infantry.
 Capt. Rowan Palmer Lemly, Infantry.
 Capt. Frank Thorp, jr., Field Artillery.
 Capt. Albert Ellicott Brown, Infantry.
 Capt. John George Donovan, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Guy L. Gearhart, Air Service.
 Capt. Leroy Pierce Collins, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Ballard Lysterly, Field Artillery.
 Capt. George Albert Wildrick, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Allen Kimberly, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Thomas Aquilla Clark, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Phillip Woodfin Booker, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Thomas Lee Coles, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. John Boursiquat Rose, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Charles Tillman Harris, jr., Field Artillery.
 Capt. Maxwell Murray, Field Artillery.
 Capt. William Edgar Shedd, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Royal Kemp Greene, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Howard Kendall Loughry, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Robert Price Glassburn, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Harry Keneth Rutherford, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Paul Jones Horton, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Fred Taylor Cruse, Field Artillery.
 Capt. James Preston Marley, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Robert Arthur, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. John Patrick Keller, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Lucian Dent Booth, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Henry Lee Watson, Cavalry.
 Capt. Murray Blight Rush, Cavalry.
 Capt. Waldo Charles Potter, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Henry Henderson Pfeil, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Thurman Harrison Bane, Air Service.
 Capt. Clyde Leslie Eastman, Infantry.
 Capt. Jesse Cyrus Drain, Infantry.
 Capt. Alexander Wheeler Chilton, Infantry.
 Capt. William Eric Morrison, Infantry.
 Capt. Donald James MacLachlan, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Henry Rice, Infantry.
 Capt. Melvin Guy Paris, Infantry.
 Capt. Alexander William Maish, Infantry.
 Capt. William Jackson McCaughey, Infantry.
 Capt. Eugene Ross Householder, Infantry.
 Capt. James Gilbert Taylor, Infantry.
 Capt. Eugene Santschi, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. William Addleman Ganoe, Infantry.
 Capt. Elmer Franklin Rice, Infantry.
 Capt. Augustine Warner Robins, Cavalry.
 Capt. William Ducachet Geary, Cavalry.
 Capt. Emil Pehr Pierson, Cavalry.
 Capt. Clark Porter Chandler, Cavalry.
 Capt. John Walton Lang, Infantry.
 Capt. George Thomas Everett, Infantry.
 Capt. Henry Harley Arnold, Infantry.
 Capt. Walter Raymond Wheeler, Infantry.
 Capt. George Frederick Ney Dailey, Infantry.
 Capt. Richard Huntington Kimball, Cavalry.
 Capt. Abbott Boone, Cavalry.
 Capt. Barton Kyle Yount, Infantry.
 Capt. Denham Bohart Crafton, Infantry.
 Capt. William Lewis Moose, jr., Cavalry.
 Capt. Frederick Story Snyder, Cavalry.
 Capt. William Elliot Selbie, Infantry.
 Capt. William Carroll Christy, Cavalry.
 Capt. Sloan Doak, Cavalry.
 Capt. John Logan Jenkins, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Henry White, Infantry.
 Capt. Alvin Gustav Gutensohn, Infantry.
 Capt. Stanley Livingston James, Infantry.
 Capt. John Stephen Sullivan, Infantry.
 Capt. Leland Wadsworth, jr., Cavalry.
 Capt. David Grover Cleveland Garrison, Infantry.
 Capt. James Lawton Collins, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Evan Elias Lewis, Infantry.
 Capt. William Caldwell McChord, Cavalry.
 Capt. William Rudicil Henry, Cavalry.
 Capt. James Howard Laubach, Infantry.
 Capt. George Richard Harrison, Infantry.
 Capt. Ralph Wayne Dusenbury, Infantry.
 Capt. Thomas Charles Spencer, Infantry.
 Capt. Robert Mercer Cheney, Cavalry.

Capt. Fauntley Muse Miller, Infantry.
 Capt. Ray Corson Hill, Infantry.
 Capt. Thomas Mayne Reid Herron, Infantry.
 Capt. Thomas Franklin McNeill, Infantry.
 Capt. John Gavin Tyndall, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Alfred Lawrence Pearson Sands, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Charles Peaslee George, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Charles William Harlow, Field Artillery.
 Capt. John Delbert Reardan, Infantry.
 Capt. Ernest Leonard Pell, Infantry.
 Capt. William Henry Rucker, Field Artillery.
 Capt. William Henry Shepherd, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Marshall Guion Randol, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Joseph Carmoreau Hatle, Infantry.
 Capt. George Meredith Peek, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. William Pegram Wilson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Charles Laurance Williams, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Alexander James Stuart, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Chester Jennings Goodier, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Robert Emory Vose, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. John Stuart Williams, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. John Nesmith Greely, Field Artillery.
 Capt. George Ruhlén, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. John Waring Simons, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. John Edward Mort, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Charles Pope Hollingsworth, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Edward Graham Taylor, Infantry.
 Capt. Webster Allyn Capron, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Thomas Donaldson Sloan, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Frederick Monroe Barrows, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Alfred Henry Erck, Infantry.
 Capt. Henry Wirt Thomas Eglín, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Walter Scott Greacen, Infantry.
 Capt. Cary Ingram Crockett, Infantry.
 Capt. José Perez-Brown, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Lawrence Wright McIntosh, Cavalry.
 Capt. James Henry Burns, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Everett Strait Hughes, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Thomas Jefferson Smith, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Roger Sheffield Parrott, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Oliver Andrews Dickinson, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Richard Edgar Cummins, Cavalry.
 Capt. Telesphor George Gottschalk, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Harvey Douglas Higley, Field Artillery.
 Capt. James Wilbur Lyon, Coast Artillery.
 Capt. Harold Geiger, Air Service.
 Capt. Rodney Hamilton Smith, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Albert Lawrence Loustalot, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Richard Donovan, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Robert Clive Rodgers, Cavalry.
 Capt. Homer Havron Slaughter, Infantry.
 Capt. Sanderford Jarman, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Clair Warren Baird, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Edward Willis Putney, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Gilbert Marshall, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Henry Clinton Kress Mühlenberg, Infantry.
 Capt. Lewis Lindsay Pendleton, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. John Francis Curry, Infantry.
 Capt. James Eugene Chaney, Infantry.
 Capt. Thomas Alexander Terry, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Edward Nicoll Woodbury, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Philip Gordon, Cavalry.
 Capt. William Jay Fitzmaurice, Infantry.
 Capt. Carl Cogswell Oakes, Infantry.
 Capt. John Thomas Kennedy, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Ray Longfellow Avery, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Horace Meek Hickam, Cavalry.
 Capt. Owen Riggs Meredith, Infantry.
 Capt. James Clifford Williams, Infantry.
 Capt. Edward Alexander Stockton, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Homer McLaughlin Groninger, Cavalry.
 Capt. Robert Emmett O'Brien, Infantry.
 Capt. James Hutchings Cunningham, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Stewart Oscar Elting, Cavalry.
 Capt. Simon Bolivar Buckner, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. John Kimball Brown, Cavalry.
 Capt. Charles Hartwell Bonesteel, Infantry.
 Capt. Richard David Newman, Cavalry.
 Capt. Thomas Jefferson Johnson, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Allison Barnes Deans, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Robert Howe Fletcher, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. William Henry Garrison, jr., Cavalry.
 Capt. Frederick Ambrose Barker, Infantry.
 Capt. Agard Hyde Bailey, Infantry.
 Capt. Sumner McBee Williams, Cavalry.

Capt. Henry Wallace Hall, Cavalry.
 Capt. John Hutchison Hester, Infantry.
 Capt. Franklin Langley Whitley, Infantry.
 Capt. Alfred Harold Hobley, Infantry.
 Capt. Elmer Cuthbert Desobry, Infantry.
 Capt. Arthur Earl Wilbourn, Cavalry.
 Capt. Emile Victor Cutrer, Infantry.
 Capt. Harry Bowers Crea, Infantry.
 Capt. Robert Christie Cotton, Infantry.
 Capt. George Barrett Glover, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. Henry John Weeks, Infantry.
 Capt. Roy Alison Hill, Infantry.
 Capt. Enoch Barton Garey, Infantry.
 Capt. Leonard H. Drennan, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Kilbourne Nulsen, Infantry.
 Capt. Theodore Kendall Spencer, Infantry.
 Capt. Ernest Grove Cullum, Cavalry.
 Capt. Edwin Martin Watson, Field Artillery.
 Capt. William Walter Erwin, Cavalry.
 Capt. Charles Dudley Hartman, Infantry.
 Capt. Edgar Simpson Miller, Infantry.
 Capt. Thomas Clement Loneragan, Infantry.
 Capt. Albert Lee Sneed, Infantry.
 Capt. Lester David Baker, Infantry.
 Capt. Walter Reed Weaver, Infantry.
 Capt. William Whinery Hicks, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Eugene Bonfils Walker, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Roy Walter Winton, Infantry.
 Capt. Frederick Colwell Phelps, Infantry.
 Capt. John Burges Johnson, Cavalry.
 Capt. Edmund Russell Andrews, Infantry.
 Capt. Joseph Albert Rogers, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Max Robert Walner, Infantry.
 Capt. Karl Ferguson Baldwin, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Charles Kleber Wing, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Charles Elting Coates, Infantry.
 Capt. Frank Sperbeck, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Andrew Joseph Conroy, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Francis Eugene Brady, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Edward Postell King, jr., Field Artillery.
 Capt. Martin Conrad Shallenberger, Infantry.
 Capt. Herbert Hamlin White, Cavalry.
 Capt. John Henry Pirie, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Kenneth Sheild Perkins, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Chauncey St. Claire McNeill, Cavalry.
 Capt. Eugene Reybold, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Robert George Kirkwood, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Harold Everett Marr, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Hugo Ernst Pitz, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. William Baldrige Loughborough, Infantry.
 Capt. Joseph Wright Rumbough, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Thomas Clair Cook, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Olin Harrington Longino, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Peter Hill Ottosen, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Edgar Hall Thompson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Samuel Harvey McLeary, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Frank Keet Ross, Cavalry.
 Capt. Oral Eugene Clark, Infantry.
 Capt. Allan Clay McBride, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Joe Reese Brabson, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Herman Kobbe, Cavalry.
 Capt. John Norton Reynolds, Air Service.
 Capt. Louis David Pepin, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Leonard Craig Sparks, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Robert Coker, Air Service.
 Capt. William Ferguson Hoey, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. Rufus Foote Maddux, Chemical Warfare Service.
 Capt. Lincoln Beaumont Chambers, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. John Hale Stutesman, Infantry.
 Capt. John Alden Crane, Field Artillery.
 Capt. John Ashley Warden, Cavalry.
 Capt. James Anthony Sarratt, Infantry.
 Capt. Willis Craig Knight, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Frank Melvin Kennedy, Air Service.
 Capt. John Robert Ellis, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. John Thomas Harris, Quartermaster Corps.
 Capt. Albert Sidney Johnston Tucker, Infantry.
 Capt. Marion Ogilvie French, Infantry.
 Capt. Frederick Almyron Prince, Field Artillery.
 Capt. John Mather, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Chester Raymond Snow, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. George William Carlyle Whiting, Infantry.
 Capt. Robert Emmett Mason Goolrick, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Marshall Magruder, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Walter Putney Boatwright, Coast Artillery Corps.

Capt. John Piper Smith, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Charles Winslow Elliott, Infantry.
 Capt. George Richard Koehler, Infantry.
 Capt. Oliver Seth Wood, Infantry.
 Capt. Allen Mitchell Burdett, Infantry.
 Capt. Wilbur Rogers, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Edwin Kennedy Smith, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Louis Roberts Dougherty, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Samuel Roland Hopkins, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Charles Dudley Daly, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Albert Kenny Craven Palmer, Quartermaster Corps,
 since retired from active service.
 Capt. John Caffery Walker, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. Clarence Talmage Marsh, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Frederick Warren Stewart, Field Artillery.
 Capt. John Blackwell Maynard, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Jacob Frank, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Jacob Herman Rudolph, Air Service.
 Capt. Elbe Allen Lathrop, Air Service.
 Capt. Raymond Ceward Baird, Infantry.
 Capt. Warren Reigle Bell, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Arthur Griffith Campbell, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Matthew Addison Palen, Infantry.
 Capt. Joseph Taylor Clement, Infantry.
 Capt. Frederick LeRoy Martin, Air Service.
 Capt. John Oscar Lackey, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Seth Lathrop Weld, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Thomas Clinton Fain, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Bert Elmer Nickerson, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Harold Lincoln Gardiner, Cavalry.
 Capt. Robert Addison Gilmore, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Hugh Straughn, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Raymond St. James Bowman, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Edwin Hurlburt Rackley, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Edward Parfit, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Clinton Thomas Alden, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Eacott Berton Miller, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Jenner Young Chisum, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Frederick Clifford Rogers, Infantry.
 Capt. Claude De Busy Hunt, Cavalry.
 Capt. Robert Clifton Garrett, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Harry Jackson Castles, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Burton Ebenezer Bowen, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Guy Brandon Lawrason, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Laurence Tidd Walker, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Otto Harry Schrader, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Isaac Edwin Titus, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Halstead Powell Councilman, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Arthur Haldane Doig, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Robert Elton Guthrie, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. William Robert Nichols, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Paul Henry Herman, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Oscar Czar Warner, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Frank Sheldon Clark, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Kelley Benjamin Lemmon, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. William Skinner Fulton, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Thomas Ogden Humphreys, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Donald MacQueen Ashbridge, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Hollis LeRoy Muller, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Eli Elmer Bennett, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Charles Todd Richardson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Clarence Edward Partridge, Infantry.
 Capt. Leo James Ahern, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Donald Meredith Beere, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Homer Ray Oldfield, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Herman Erienkotter, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Claude B. Thummel, Ordnance Department.
 Capt. Norton Meade Beardslee, Coast Artillery Corps, since
 retired from active service.
 Capt. Harold Earl Miner, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Norman Butler Briscoe, Cavalry.
 Capt. James Leo Dunsworth, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Elbert Eli Farman, jr., Cavalry.
 Capt. Ronald DeVore Johnson, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Thom Catron, Infantry.
 Capt. Francis Greason Delano, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Jacob Loucks Devers, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Philip Hayes, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Franz August Doniat, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Raphael Robert Nix, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. James Lawrence Walsh, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Carl Adolph Baehr, Field Artillery.
 Capt. George Smith Patton, jr., Cavalry.
 Capt. Henry Horace Malven, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Edward Luke Kelly, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. James Garssche Ord, Infantry.
 Capt. Thurston Hughes, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Robert Stanley Donaldson, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Wallace Copeland Philoon, Infantry, subject to examina-
 tion required by law.
 Capt. Charles Bartell Meyer, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Herbert LeRoy Taylor, Infantry.
 Capt. James Rowland Hill, Cavalry.
 Capt. Frederick Arthur Mountford, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Delos Carleton Emmons, Air Service.
 Capt. Arnold Norman Krogstad, Air Service.
 Capt. Eley Parker Denson, Infantry.
 Capt. Thomas DeWitt Milling, Air Service.
 Capt. Roy Howard Coles, Signal Corps.
 Capt. Henry Dorsey Farnandis Munnikhuysen, Quartermaster
 Corps.
 Capt. Philip Stearns Gage, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Robert Lawrence Eichelberger, Infantry.
 Capt. Monte Jackson Hickok, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Robert Charles Frederick Goetz, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Archibald Toombs Cooley, Cavalry.
 Capt. Edwin Forrest Harding, Infantry.
 Capt. Theodore Mosher Chase, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Carleton George Chapman, Cavalry.
 Capt. Arthur Rutledge Underwood, Infantry.
 Capt. Robert Sears, Infantry.
 Capt. Joseph Plassmeyer, Cavalry.
 Capt. Chester Paddock Mills, Cavalry.
 Capt. Lee Dunnington Davis, Infantry.
 Capt. Edwin Russell Van Deusen, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Frank Leroy Purdon, Infantry.
 Capt. Merl Paul Schillerstrom, Infantry.
 Capt. Carlin Curtis Stokely, Infantry.
 Capt. Louis Philip Ford, Infantry.
 Capt. John May McDowell, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Clifford Bluemel, Infantry.
 Capt. Wentworth Harris Moss, Infantry.
 Capt. Manton Campbell Mitchell, Infantry.
 Capt. William Hood Simpson, Infantry.
 Capt. Walker Evans Hobson, Infantry.
 Capt. William Charles Koenig, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Harry Walter Stephenson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Lucien Helm Taliaferro, Field Artillery.
 Capt. John Charles Fremont Tillson, jr., Cavalry.
 Capt. Vernon George Olsmith, Infantry.
 Capt. Ralph Ernest Jones, Infantry.
 Capt. Herbert Hamilton Acheson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Willis Shippam, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Frank Dexter Applin, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Rollin Larrabee Tilton, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. John Keel Jemison, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Furman Edgar McCammon, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Raymond Eliot Lee, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Louis Blaine Bender, Signal Corps.
 Capt. Augustus Norton, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Thomas Jamerson Cecil, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Ralph Chrystal Harrison, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Francis Page Hardaway, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Clement Craig Heth, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Frederic Alton Price, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Edward Prescott Noyes, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Charles Elliott Ide, Field Artillery.
 Capt. William David Frazer, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. George Fleming Moore, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Roy Robert Lyon, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Jason McVay Austin, Field Artillery.
 Capt. George Lane Van Deusen, Signal Corps.
 Capt. Leopoldo Mercader, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry.
 Capt. Frank Asbury Turner, Field Artillery.
 Capt. James Albert McGrath, Infantry.
 Capt. Courtney Hicks Hodges, Infantry.
 Capt. Rollo Curtin Ditte, Infantry.
 Capt. James Henry Tierney, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Frederick Martin Armstrong, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Joseph Cumming Thomas, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Isaac Joshua Nichol, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. John Adoniram Sterling, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. William Patrick Kelleher, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Edwin Larkin Zinn, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. William Henry Sullivan, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Clarence McCain McMurray, Infantry.
 Capt. Guy Ichabod Rowe, Quartermaster Corps.
 Capt. George Stevens Gay, Field Artillery.
 Capt. John Magruder, Field Artillery, subject to examination
 required by law.

Capt. Charles Martin Everitt, Quartermaster Corps.
 Capt. Per Ramee, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Harrison Cressy Browne, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Herbert Lantz, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. James Henry Reynolds, jr., Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Harley Cleveland Dagley, Cavalry.
 Capt. William Nichols Porter, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. George Howard Brett, Air Service.
 Capt. Maurice Benjamin Willett, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Robert Elmer Jones, Infantry.
 Capt. Alexander Warner Cleary, Infantry.
 Capt. George Marshall Parker, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. Belton O'Neill Kennedy, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Cary Robinson Wilson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. John Herman Hood, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Richard Stearns Dodson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Christopher Dudley Peirce, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Philip Ljungstedt Milnor, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Joseph Fredrick Cottrell, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Edward Lathrop Dyer, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Wallace Loring Clay, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Walter Lucas Clark, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Simon Willard Sperry, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Daniel Nanny Swan, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Charles McHenry Steese, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Harry Wylie Stovall, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Fenelon Cannon, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Richard Ferguson Cox, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. John Piersol McCaskey, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Edward Stuart Harrison, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. David McCoach, jr., Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Edgar Warren Taulbee, Cavalry.
 Capt. Dwight Knowlton Shurtleff, Ordnance Department.
 Capt. Francis Henry Miles, jr., Ordnance Department.
 Capt. Fred Clute Wallace, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Burton Oliver Lewis, Ordnance Department.
 Capt. Herbert Raymond Odell, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Reginald Bifield Cocroft, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Clyde Andrew Selleck, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Kenneth Bailey Harmon, Ordnance Department.
 Capt. Ernest Joseph Dawley, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Elmore Beach Gray, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Herbert O'Leary, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Louie Arnold Beard, Quartermaster Corps.
 Capt. Willard Karle Richards, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Harry Dwight Chamberlin, Cavalry.
 Capt. James Irvin Muir, Infantry.
 Capt. John Julius Waterman, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Ivens Jones, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Frank Drake, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Meade Wildrick, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Frederick Arthur Holmer, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Daniel Huston Torrey, Infantry.
 Capt. John Millikin, Cavalry.
 Capt. Fred Seydel, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Durward Saunders Wilson, Infantry.
 Capt. Parker Cromwell Kallach, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. Maurice Duncan Welty, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Albert Chapman, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Joseph Eugene Carberry, Infantry.
 Capt. Frank Floyd Scowden, Quartermaster Corps.
 Capt. Emmett Wilbur Smith, Infantry.
 Capt. Herbert Edgar Marshburn, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Hines, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Jack Whitehead Heard, Cavalry.
 Capt. William Armistead Pendleton, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Walter Kilshaw Dunn, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Charles Manor Haverkamp, Cavalry.
 Capt. Walter Hale Frank, Air Service.
 Capt. Guy Woodman Chipman, Cavalry.
 Capt. Fred Barnes Carrithers, Infantry.
 Capt. Frederick Elwood Uhl, Infantry.
 Capt. Edgar Willis Burr, Cavalry.
 Capt. Harvey Henry Fletcher, Infantry.
 Capt. John Erle Beller, Infantry.
 Capt. John Frederick Landis, Infantry.
 Capt. Joseph Stephens Leonard, Infantry.
 Capt. John Arner Robenson, Cavalry.
 Capt. Joseph Page Aleshire, Cavalry.
 Capt. Walter Moore, Infantry.
 Capt. Oscar Wolverton Griswold, Infantry.
 Capt. Harding Polk, Cavalry.
 Capt. Robert Horace Dunlop, Infantry.
 Capt. John Richard Walker, Infantry.
 Capt. Allen Richland Edwards, Coast Artillery Corps.

Capt. Emil Fred Reinhardt, Infantry.
 Capt. John Gray Thornell, Air Service.
 Capt. William Augustus Beach, Infantry.
 Capt. John Thomas Hazelrig O'Rear, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Ralph Edward Haines, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Thomas Hardaway Jones, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Laurence Watts, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Henry Newbold Sumner, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Edward Roth, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. George Winship Easterday, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Austin Garfield Frick, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Sydney Smith Winslow, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Wilmot Alfred Danielson, Quartermaster Corps.
 Capt. Francis Joseph Torney, Quartermaster Corps.
 Capt. Bolos Elder Brewer, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Edgar Bergman Colladay, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. James Allan Stevens, Infantry.
 Capt. Emmert Wohlleben Savage, Infantry.
 Capt. Frederick Ramon Garcin, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Tolbert Frank Hardin, Infantry.
 Capt. Douglas Campbell Cordiner, Quartermaster Corps.
 Capt. Julian Sommerville Hatcher, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Benjamin Lafayette Carroll, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Bernard Robertson Peyton, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Whitmon Robert Conolly, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Frank Anderson Sloan, Infantry.
 Capt. Everett Collins, Cavalry.
 Capt. Russell Peter Hartle, Infantry.
 Capt. Oswald Hurtt Saunders, Infantry.
 Capt. Spencer Ball Akin, Signal Corps.
 Capt. Robert Gibson Sherrard, Infantry.
 Capt. John Wesley Hyatt, Infantry.
 Capt. Ralph Waldo Wilson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Fred Mortimer Green, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Delmar Samuel Lenzner, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Roland Wilbur Pinger, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Donald Armstrong, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Franklin Babcock, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Hermann Heinrich Zornig, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Gladeon Marcus Barnes, Ordnance Department.
 Capt. Raycroft Walsh, Air Service.
 Capt. Harvey Clark Allen, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Edward Bennett Dennis, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Leon Moffat Logan, Quartermaster Corps.
 Capt. Roger Baldwin Colton, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Enrique Urrutia, jr., Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry.
 Capt. Arturo Moreno, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry.
 Capt. Oliver Loving Spiller, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Ruskin Peirce Hall, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Walter William Vautsmeier, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. James Madison White, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Spencer Elwell Shearer, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Frank Brezina, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Seth Harold Frear, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. John Henry Mellom, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Herbert Edward Pace, Infantry.
 Capt. Gunnar J. Mortenson, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. John Emmitt Sloan, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Frederick Rodman Palmer, Quartermaster Corps.
 Capt. Alexander Wilson, Infantry.
 Capt. Xavier Francis Blauvelt, Infantry.
 Capt. Frank Dorwin Lackland, Air Service.
 Capt. Joseph Andrews, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Albert Samuel Peake, Infantry.
 Capt. Floyd D. Garlock, Infantry.
 Capt. Cushman Hartwell, Cavalry.
 Capt. Arthur Boettcher, Infantry.
 Capt. Horace Thurber Aplington, Cavalry.
 Capt. Fred Livingood Walker, Infantry.
 Capt. Alvan Cullom Gillem, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. Rapp Brush, Infantry.
 Capt. Bert Milton Atkinson, Infantry.
 Capt. Edward George McCormick, Infantry.
 Capt. Philip Bracken Fleming, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Joseph Cowles Mehaffey, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Paul Sorg Reinecke, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Raymond Albert Wheeler, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. William Benjamin Hardigg, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Harry Russell Kutz, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Adam Schimelfenig, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Thompson Lawrence, Infantry.
 Capt. Freeman Wate Bowley, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Charles Reuben Baxter, Ordnance Department.
 Capt. Gustav Henry Franke, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Hubert Gregory Stanton, Ordnance Department.

Capt. John Everard Hatch, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Charles Anderson Walker, jr., Ordnance Department.
 Capt. Bethel Wood Simpson, Ordnance Department.
 Capt. Harold Floyd Nichols, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Harry James Keeley, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Philip Hall, Infantry.
 Capt. Alexander Day Surles, Cavalry.
 Capt. William Edmund Larned, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Franklin Kemble, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Alfred John Betcher, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Karl Slaughter Bradford, Cavalry.
 Capt. Herbert Arthur Dargue, Air Service.
 Capt. John Griffith Booton, Ordnance Department.
 Capt. Frederick Gilbreath, Quartermaster Corps.
 Capt. George Richmond Hicks, Infantry.
 Capt. James Blanchard Crawford, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Haig Shekerjian, Infantry.
 Capt. Benjamin Curtis Lockwood, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. Robert W. Clark, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Harrison Henry Cocke Richards, Air Service.
 Capt. Carroll Armstrong Bagby, Infantry.
 Capt. Arthur Bayard Conard, Cavalry.
 Capt. Oliver Stelling McCleary, Infantry.
 Capt. Frederick Gilbert Dillman, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Gregory Holsinger, Infantry.
 Capt. Ziba Lloyd Drollinger, Infantry.
 Capt. Jesse Amos Ladd, Infantry.
 Capt. Paul William Baade, Infantry.
 Capt. James Roy Newman Weaver, Infantry.
 Capt. John Porter Lucas, Field Artillery.
 Capt. William Henry Harrison Morris, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. Carl Fish McKinney, Infantry.
 Capt. Roscoe Conkling Batson, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Allen Russell Kimball, Infantry.
 Capt. Wilfrid Mason Blunt, Cavalry.
 Capt. Ira Adelbert Rader, Air Service.
 Capt. Alvan Crosby Sandeford, Field Artillery.
 Capt. William Jay Calvert, Quartermaster Corps.
 Capt. Kenneth Ebbecke Kern, Infantry.
 Capt. David Hamilton Cowles, Infantry.
 Capt. Ira Thomas Wyche, Field Artillery.
 Capt. James Craig Riddle Schwenck, Cavalry.
 Capt. Arthur Clyde Evans, Infantry.
 Capt. John Louis Homer, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Thomas Jonathan Jackson Christian, Field Artillery.
 Capt. George Derby Holland, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Austin McCarthy McDonnell, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Howell Marion Estes, Cavalry.
 Capt. John Furman Wall, Cavalry.
 Capt. Leo Gerald Heffernan, Cavalry.
 Capt. Edwin Noel Hardy, Cavalry.
 Capt. Thomas G. M. Oliphant, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Douglas Blakeshaw Netherwood, Air Service.
 Capt. Mert Proctor, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Joseph Dorst Patch, Infantry.
 Capt. Archibald Delos Cowley, Infantry.
 Capt. William John Wrona, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Felix Englebert Gross, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. George Ralph Meyer, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Andrew Lewis Pendleton, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Lewis Hyde Brereton, Air Service.
 Capt. Cherubusco Newton, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Vincent Paul Erwin, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Edward Lincoln Hoffman, Air Service.
 Capt. Frank Bloom, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Casper Ball Rucker, Infantry.
 Capt. Robert Currier Brady, Quartermaster Corps.
 Capt. Hugh Johnston Knerr, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. John Page Edgerly, Infantry.
 Capt. George Frederick Humbert, Finance Department.
 Capt. Arthur Woodfin Ford, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Reuben Noel Perley, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Vincent Meyer, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Joseph Ray Cygon, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Edward Harold Hicks, Field Artillery.
 Capt. John Holmes Birdsall, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Herbert Elliott Taylor, Cavalry.
 Capt. Lindsay McDonald Silvester, Infantry.
 Capt. William Middleton Grimes, Cavalry.
 Capt. Herbert Marshall Pool, Infantry.
 Capt. Leonard Townsend Gerow, Infantry.
 Capt. Henry Joseph Moody Smith, Cavalry.
 Capt. George Derry Murphey, Infantry.
 Capt. Norman Whittenmore Peek, Air Service.
 Capt. William Clayton Rose, Infantry.

Capt. Wesley Frost Ayer, Infantry.
 Capt. Malcolm Wheeler-Nicholson, Cavalry.
 Capt. Norman Potter Morrow, Field Artillery.
 Capt. George Crawford Elsey, Infantry.
 Capt. James Ambrose O'Brien, Infantry.
 Capt. Lloyd Edmonstone Jones, Field Artillery.
 Capt. George Abel Sanford, Infantry.
 Capt. Alexander LeRoy Padwinetz Johnson, Infantry.
 Capt. Walter Ferrell Winton, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Maxon Spafford Lough, Infantry.
 Capt. Newton Napoleon Polk, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Ford Richardson, Infantry.
 Capt. Henry Lawrence Cullen Jones, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Lester Maple Wheeler, Infantry.
 Capt. Edwin O'Connor, Cavalry.
 Capt. Eugene Alexander Lohman, Cavalry.
 Capt. Kenneth Prince Lord, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Eugene Warren Fales, Infantry.
 Capt. Edward Alexander Miller, jr., Field Artillery.
 Capt. John Taylor Rhett, Infantry.
 Capt. Livingston Watrous, Infantry.
 Capt. Emanuel Villard Heidt, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Stanley Little, Infantry.
 Capt. Herbert Alonzo Wadsworth, Infantry.
 Capt. Harold Clifford Lutz, Cavalry.
 Capt. John Moore Thompson, Cavalry.
 Capt. George Matthew Halloran, Infantry.
 Capt. William Edward Brouger, Infantry.
 Capt. Medorem Crawford, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. Sumner Waite, Infantry.
 Capt. Albert Monmouth Jones, Infantry.
 Capt. John Edward Creed, Infantry.
 Capt. Harrison McAlpine, Infantry.
 Capt. James Raymond Alfante, Quartermaster Corps.
 Capt. Gerald Ellis Cronin, Infantry.
 Capt. Glenn Perrine Wilhelm, Ordnance Department.
 Capt. Andrew Goolsby Gardner, Infantry.
 Capt. Albert Simon Kuegle, Infantry.
 Capt. Levin Hicks Campbell, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Follett Bradley, Air Service.
 Capt. Jonathan Waverly Anderson, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Serafin Manuel Montesinos, Infantry.
 Capt. Pedro Angel Hernandez, Infantry.
 Capt. Harold De Forest Burdick, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. John Absalom Baird, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Philip Guillou Blackmore, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Henry Clarence Davis, jr., Ordnance Department.
 Capt. Theodore Rodes Murphy, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Benjamin Noble Booth, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Edwin French Silkman, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Octave De Carré, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Robert Shemer Oberly, Ordnance Department.
 Capt. Claude Martin Thiele, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Avery Johnson French, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Edward Montgomery, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Shepler Ward Fitzgerald, Air Service.
 Capt. Leigh Francis Joseph Zerbe, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Coleman Wortham Jenkins, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Wilmer Townsend Scott, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Herbert Eugene Ellis, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Randolph Tucker Pendleton, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Stewart Woods Stanley, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Kenneth Thompson Blood, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Roy Silas Atwood, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Samuel Franklin Hawkins, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Jesse Lowry Sinclair, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Oscar Krupp, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Carleton Ula Edwards, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Charles Thomas Stahle, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Charles Meigs Wood, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Edwin Joseph O'Hara, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Alden George Strong, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Rudolph William Riefkohl, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. John Parke Leavenworth, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Alexander Camman Sullivan, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Joseph Peter Vachon, Infantry.
 Capt. Lloyd Baxter Bennett, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Abraham Garfinkel, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Pedro Diaz Dulay, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Thomas Austin Lynch, Philippine Scouts.
 First Lieut. Edward James Oliver, Infantry.
 Capt. Albert Tucker, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Earle La Forest Hunt, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. John Frederick Daye, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Frederic Waldo Whitney, Cavalry.

Capt. Clifford Mitchell Tuteur, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Clarence Leslie Gilbert, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Arthur Eugene Rowland, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Leon R. Cole, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Lee Roland Watrous, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Joseph David Brown, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Leslie MacDill, Air Service.
 Capt. Charles Augustus French, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. John Albert Hoag, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Oscar Andrew Eastwood, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Earl Herbert Metzger, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. John O'Brien, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Vicente Rico Barros, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Matthew John Gunner, Infantry.
 Capt. Daniel Edward Murphy, Cavalry.
 Capt. James Ripley Jacobs, Infantry.
 Capt. Julian Francis Barnes, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Robert Scott Lytle, Infantry.
 Capt. Harold Cornelius Vanderveer, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Kenna Granville Eastham, Cavalry.
 Capt. Henry Terrell, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. Thomas James Camp, Infantry.
 Capt. Cliff Andrus, Field Artillery.
 Capt. James Powers Yancey, Cavalry.
 Capt. Harry Albert Musham, Infantry.
 Capt. Lawrence Sprague Churchill, Air Service.
 Capt. George Elmer Arneman, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Dale Francis McDonald, Infantry.
 Capt. Paul Kimball Johnson, Infantry.
 Capt. Raymond Eugene McQuillin, Cavalry.
 Capt. Edward Hiltner Bertram, Infantry.
 Capt. Hayes Adlai Kroner, Infantry.
 Capt. De Forest Willard Morton, Quartermaster Corps.
 Capt. Allan Stuart Boyd, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. Francis Clinton Vincent Crowley, Cavalry.
 Capt. Harry Lewis Twaddle, Infantry.
 Capt. George Everett Adams Reinburg, Cavalry.
 Capt. Clarence Leonard Tinker, Infantry.
 Capt. William Robert White, Infantry.
 Capt. Donald Bridgman Sanger, Infantry.
 Capt. Martin Francis Scanlon, Air Service.
 Capt. William Hanson Gill, Infantry.
 First Lieut. Ralph Kinnear Fletcher, Infantry.
 Capt. Frank Theodore McCabe, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Howard Sharp Bennion, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. William Carrington Sherman, Air Service.
 Capt. Roscoe Campbell Crawford, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Milo Pitcher Fox, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Lee Otis Wright, Ordnance Department.
 Capt. Lewis Andrews Nickerson, Ordnance Department.
 Capt. Philip Ries Faymonville, Ordnance Department.
 Capt. Russell Lamonte Maxwell, Ordnance Department.
 Capt. William Coffin Harrison, Field Artillery.
 Capt. John Shirley Wood, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Charles Janvrin Browne, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Robert Henry Lee, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. William Henry Walmsley Youngs, Cavalry.
 Capt. David McLean Crawford, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Oscar James Gatchell, Ordnance Department.
 Capt. John Nathaniel Hauser, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Thomas Jay Hayes, Ordnance Department.
 Capt. Richard Emmanuel Anderson, Field Artillery.
 Capt. d'Alary Fec'hé, Infantry.
 Capt. Cris Miles Burlingame, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Raymond Vincent Cramer, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. William Hale Wilbur, Infantry.
 Capt. Sidney Parker Spalding, Ordnance Department.
 Capt. Byron Quinby Jones, Air Service.
 Capt. Stephen Harrison MacGregor, Ordnance Department.
 Capt. James Albert Gillespie, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Basil Duke Edwards, Infantry.
 Capt. Davenport Johnson, Air Service.
 Capt. James Kirk, Ordnance Department.
 Capt. Robert McGowan Littlejohn, Cavalry.
 Capt. Wade Hampton Haislip, Infantry.
 Capt. Robert Nall Bodine, Ordnance Department.
 Capt. James Harve Johnson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Harry Albert Flint, Cavalry.
 Capt. Walter Melville Robertson, Infantry.
 Capt. John Henry Lindt, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Harold Burling Sampson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Pearl Lee Thomas, Cavalry.
 Capt. Sidney Vincent Bingham, Cavalry.
 Capt. Bird Spencer DuBois, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Isaac Spalding, Field Artillery.

Capt. Cyril Augustine Phelan, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Harry James Malony, Field Artillery.
 Capt. John Hartwell Hinemon, jr., Signal Corps.
 Capt. Henry Lytton Flynn, Cavalry.
 Capt. Robert Fee Hyatt, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Harold Marvin Rayner, Cavalry.
 Capt. Charles Nathaniel Sawyer, Signal Corps.
 Capt. Gilbert Richard Cook, Infantry.
 Capt. Max Weston Sullivan, Infantry.
 Capt. Stephen Marston Walmsley, Signal Corps.
 Capt. Franklin Cummings Sibert, Infantry.
 Capt. Archibald Vincent Arnold, Field Artillery.
 Capt. John Nicholas Smith, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. Stephen J. Chamberlin, Infantry.
 Capt. John Traylor McLane, Cavalry.
 Capt. William Horace Hobson, Infantry.
 Capt. Walter Glenn Kilner, Air Service.
 Capt. Raymond Oscar Barton, Infantry.
 Capt. James Sylvester Mooney, Cavalry.
 Capt. Henry William Harms, Air Service.
 Capt. John Earl Lewis, Cavalry.
 Capt. Walton Harris Walker, Infantry.
 Capt. Millard Fillmore Harmon, jr., Air Service.
 Capt. John Duncan Kelly, Cavalry.
 Capt. Edward Chamberlin Rose, Infantry.
 Capt. Albert Eger Brown, Infantry.
 Capt. William Nalle, Cavalry.
 Capt. Gustav Jacob Gonser, Infantry.
 Capt. Ralph Cadot Holliday, Infantry.
 Capt. William Gaulbert Weaver, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Chisholm Drake, Quartermaster Corps.
 Capt. William Joseph Morrissey, Infantry.
 Capt. Robert Theodore Snow, Infantry.
 Capt. Henry Charles McLean, Infantry.
 Capt. Frank Victor Schneider, Infantry.
 Capt. Frank Joseph Riley, Infantry.
 Capt. Benjamin Franklin Delamater, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. Ralph Samuel Kimball, Infantry.
 Capt. Roy Oscar Henry, Cavalry.
 Capt. Francis Bernard Mallon, Infantry.
 Capt. Lathrop Boyd Clapham, Infantry.
 Capt. John Dilworth von Holtzendorff, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Carl James Adler, Infantry.
 Capt. Otto Godfrey Pitz, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Theophilus Steele, Infantry.
 Capt. Lindsley Dykeman Beach, Cavalry.
 Capt. Burton Young Read, Cavalry.
 Capt. George Hubert Gardiner, Infantry.
 Capt. Chester Cardwell Staples, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Harry William Stark, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Duncan Grant Richart, Cavalry.
 Capt. Oliver Mayhew Ladd, Philippine Scouts.
 Capt. Archie Stanton Buyers, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. William Ayres Borden, Ordnance Department.
 Capt. Francis Tuttle Armstrong, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Edwin Bright Spiller, Finance Department.
 Capt. Cecil George Young, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Carl Andrew Waldmann, Ordnance Department.
 Capt. Paul Wesley Evans, Signal Corps.
 Capt. Henry Armstrong Wingate, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. William Claude Washington, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Alfred Bixby Quinton, jr., Ordnance Department.
 Capt. Hamilton Templeton, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Bertram Frankenberger, Field Artillery.
 Capt. John Keith Boles, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Edward Fuller Witsell, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.
 Capt. Alfred Loveday Rockwood, Infantry.
 Capt. Edwin Pearson Parker, jr., Field Artillery.
 Capt. John Macaulay Eager, Field Artillery, subject to examination required by law.
 Capt. Floyd Charles Hecox, Infantry.
 Capt. Carl Adolphus Hardigg, Quartermaster Corps.
 Capt. Terry de la Mesa Allen, Cavalry.
 Capt. John Chilton McDonnell, Air Service.
 Capt. Carl Lewis Capton, Infantry.
 Capt. Jerome Willard Howe, Cavalry.
 Capt. William Rudolph Gruber, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Otto Wagner, Cavalry.
 Capt. William Trigg Pigott, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. Russell Brown Patterson, Cavalry.
 Capt. Herbert Joseph Lawes, Infantry.
 Capt. Robert Crayton Williams, Infantry.
 Capt. Clyde Vincent Simpson, Cavalry.
 Capt. Paul Xavier English, Infantry.

Capt. Estil Virgil Smith, Infantry.
 Capt. Joseph Frank Richmond, Cavalry.
 Capt. Roy Stuart Brown, Cavalry.
 Capt. Troy Houston Middleton, Infantry.
 Capt. Roland Francis Walsh, Quartermaster Corps.
 Capt. Paul Murray, Infantry.
 Capt. William Daniel Faulkner, Infantry.
 Capt. Herbert Merton Ostroski, Cavalry.
 Capt. Manning Marius Kimmel, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. John Huff Van Vliet, Infantry.
 Capt. Leland Swartz Devore, Infantry.
 Capt. Geoffrey Keyes, Cavalry.
 Capt. Charles Addison Ross, Infantry.
 Capt. Douglass Taft Greene, Infantry.
 Capt. Joseph Wadsworth Viner, Cavalry.
 Capt. Robert Meredith Perkins, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Lawrence Babbitt Weeks, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Clarence Hagbirt Danielson, Infantry.
 Capt. James Nixon Peale, Infantry.
 Capt. John Arthur Considine, Cavalry.
 Capt. David Beauregard Falk, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. William Cooper Foote, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Francis Reuel Fuller, Infantry.
 Capt. Clinton Warden Russell, Air Service.
 Capt. William Richard Schmidt, Infantry.
 Capt. Earl Lindsey Canady, Air Service.
 Capt. Louis Aleck Craig, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. George Edward Lovell, jr., Air Service.
 Capt. Otis Kellholtz Sadtler, Signal Corps.
 Capt. William Henry Jones, jr., Field Artillery.
 Capt. John Erskine Ardrey, Infantry.
 Capt. Carlyle Hilton Wash, Air Service.
 Capt. Henry Pratt Perrine, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. Dennis Edward McCunniff, Infantry.
 Capt. Henry Balding Lewis, Infantry.
 Capt. Henry Barlow Cheadle, Infantry.
 Capt. Stewart Shepherd Giffin, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Samuel Alexander Gibson, Infantry.
 Capt. Paul Woolever Newgarden, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Andrew King, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. Alexander McCarrell Patch, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Bishop Lyman, Infantry.
 Capt. Robert Lily Spragins, Infantry.
 Capt. Ward Elverson Duvall, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. James Brown Gillespie, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Charles Lawrence Kilburn, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Hans Robert Wheat Herwig, Infantry.
 Capt. Howard Calhoun Davidson, Air Service.
 Capt. William Lynn Roberts, Infantry.
 Capt. William Alexander McCulloch, Infantry.
 Capt. Paul Duke Carlisle, Field Artillery.
 Capt. William Augustus Rafferty, Infantry.
 Capt. Lathe Burton Row, Infantry.
 Capt. John Flowers Crutcher, Cavalry.
 Capt. Francis Joseph Toohey, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. George Washington Price, Infantry.
 Capt. Herbert Slayden Clarkson, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Charles Gardiner Helmick, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Madison Pearson, Infantry.
 Capt. Robert Duncan Brown, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Ernst Sedlacek, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Ray Wehnes Barker, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Henry Abbey, jr., Air Service.
 Capt. Earl Howard Coyle, Cavalry.
 Capt. Mack Garr, Cavalry.
 Capt. Edward Oliver Halbert, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Maxwell Kirby, Air Service.
 Capt. Frank Bonne Jordan, Infantry.
 Capt. Edmund Peyton Duval, Cavalry.
 Capt. Alfred Eugene Sawkins, Infantry.
 Capt. Robert Emmet Carmody, Cavalry.
 Capt. Harry Lee King, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Robert Ogden Annin, Cavalry.
 Capt. Daniel Gordon Morrisett, Cavalry.
 Capt. Augustin Mitchell Prentiss, Chemical Warfare Service.
 Capt. Ralph Hospital, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Theodore Barnes, jr., Cavalry.
 Capt. Casey Hewitt Hayes, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Harvey Buckingham Steele Burwell, Air Service.
 Capt. Charles Bellows Hazeltine, Cavalry.
 Capt. John Lloyd Burg, Infantry.
 First Lieut. Edward William Austin, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Russell Alger Osmun, Quartermaster Corps.
 Capt. Sidney Erickson, Infantry.
 Capt. Emer Yeager, Field Artillery.

Capt. Thomas Roger McCarron, Infantry.
 Capt. George Lamberton Smith, Infantry.
 Capt. Mahlen Augustus Joyce, Infantry.
 Capt. Chapman Grant, Infantry.
 Capt. William Henry Holcombe, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Charles Philip Gross, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Bernard August Miller, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Peter Cleary Bullard, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Brehon Burke Somervell, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Xenophon Herbert Price, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Robert Walter Crawford, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Frederick Snowden Skinner, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Dabney Otey Elliott, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Frederick William Herman, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. John Hill Carruth, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Philip Loomis Thurber, Field Artillery.
 Capt. William Chester Houghton, Field Artillery.
 Capt. John Churchill Wyeth, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Arthur Ringland Harris, Field Artillery.
 Capt. LaRhett Livingston Stuart, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Alfred Earl Larabee, Signal Corps.
 Capt. John Adams Brooks, jr., Ordnance Department.
 Capt. Cleveland Hill Bandholtz, Ordnance Department.
 Capt. John Green Burr, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Albion Ray Rockwood, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Frank Lawrence Hoskins, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Arthur Dow Newman, Cavalry.
 Capt. John Hamilton Jouett, Air Service.
 Capt. John Benjamin Anderson, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Cedric Watterson Lewis, Infantry.
 Capt. Joseph DeMoss McCain, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Harry Clyde Ingles, Signal Corps.
 Capt. James Lester Bradley, Infantry.
 Capt. Willis James Tack, Infantry.
 Capt. Edward Leuffer Nevin Glass, Cavalry.
 Capt. Charles Watson Foster, Cavalry.
 Capt. William Edward Burr, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Eugene Villaret, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Cuyler Llewellyn Clark, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Reiff Hesser Hannum, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Clarence Corinth Benson, Cavalry.
 Capt. Thomas Henry Rees, jr., Cavalry.
 Capt. Floyd Randall Waltz, Infantry.
 Capt. John Henry Woodberry, Ordnance Department.
 Capt. Harold Francis Loomis, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Leland Harold Stanford, Signal Corps.
 Capt. William Abbott Robertson, Air Service.
 Capt. Richard Bolles Paddock, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Carl Spatz, Air Service.
 Capt. Harold Roe Bull, Infantry.
 Capt. James Byron Haskell, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Charles Morton Milliken, Signal Corps.
 Capt. James Fred Byrom, Infantry.
 Capt. Joseph Bradford Treat, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Woodfin Grady Jones, Infantry.
 Capt. James Patrick Hogan, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Paul Clarence Paschal, Infantry.
 Capt. John Leo Parkinson, Infantry.
 Capt. Rudolph Gwinn Whitten, Infantry.
 Capt. Louis Thomas Byrne, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Gooding Packard, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Glenn Preston Anderson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Walter Cyrus Gullion, Infantry.
 Capt. Francis Marion Brannan, Infantry.
 Capt. Adam Empe Potts, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. William Rutledge Orton, Infantry.
 Capt. Francis Henry Forbes, Infantry.
 Capt. Rufus Sumter Bratton, Infantry.
 Capt. Thomas George Lanphier, Air Service.
 Capt. Sylvester DeWitt Downs, jr., Field Artillery.
 Capt. Orlando Ward, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Benjamin Grant Weir, Air Service.
 Capt. Ralph Royce, Air Service.
 Capt. Thomas Huntington Monroe, Infantry.
 Capt. Roger Burnett Harrison, Infantry.
 Capt. Benjamin Flery Hoge, Cavalry.
 Capt. Frederick Herr, Cavalry.
 Capt. Clifford James Mathews, Infantry.
 Capt. Howard Prescott Milligan, Infantry.
 Capt. Frank William Milburn, Infantry.
 Capt. Isaac Gill, jr., Infantry.
 Capt. John Kennard, Cavalry.
 Capt. John Bellinger Thompson, Cavalry.
 Capt. Hamner Huston, Infantry.
 Capt. Jens Anderson Doe, Infantry.

Capt. Sheldon Harley Wheeler, Air Service.
 Capt. Lester Leland Lampert, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.
 Capt. William Francis Maher, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Floyd Hatfield, Infantry.
 Capt. Charles Lewis Clifford, Cavalry.
 Capt. Benjamin Seymour Stocker, Infantry.
 Capt. Gaston Lee Holmes, Cavalry.
 Capt. Oscar Otto Kuentz, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Earl Landreth, Infantry.
 Capt. William Edward Raab Covell, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Joseph Dogan Arthur, jr., Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. John Stewart Bragdon, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. George Jacob Richards, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. John Scott Smylie, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Lehman Welling Miller, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Douglas Lafayette Weart, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Earl Ewart Gesler, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Edwin Alexander Bethel, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. John French Conklin, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Alfred Laing Ganahl, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. William Frazer Tompkins, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Douglas Hamilton Gillette, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Paul Alfred Hodgson, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Donald Angus Davison, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Henry Spiese Aurand, Ordnance Department.
 Capt. Thomas Bernard Larkin, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Edwin Coit Kelton, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. James Allen Lester, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Mason James Young, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Layson Enslow Atkins, Corps of Engineers.
 Capt. Herman Beukema, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Francis Joseph Dunigan, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Edwin Albert Zundel, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Clinton Wilbur Howard, Air Service.
 Capt. Charles Manly Busbee, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Albert Whitney Waldron, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Parley Doney Parkinson, Infantry.
 Capt. John Hobert Wallace, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Raymond Marsh, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Harold Eugene Small, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Henry Benton Saylor, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Joseph May Swing, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Charles Wolcott Ryder, Infantry.
 Capt. Stafford LeRoy Irwin, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Joseph Taggart McNarney, Air Service.
 Capt. Albert Henry Warren, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Omar Nelson Bradley, Infantry.
 Capt. Cedric Malcolm Stanley Skene, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Capt. Charles Carter Reynolds, Field Artillery.
 Capt. Philip Coldwell, Infantry.

To be captains with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. William Henry Sullivan, Philippine Scouts.
 First Lieut. Serafin Manuel Montesinos, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry.
 First Lieut. Pedro Angel Hernandez, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry.
 First Lieut. Carlo Antonio Pivrotto, Philippine Scouts.
 First Lieut. Thomas Roger McCarron, Infantry.
 First Lieut. Benjamin Seymour Stocker, Philippine Scouts.
 First Lieut. Anastacio Quevedo Ver, Philippine Scouts.
 First Lieut. Manuel Font, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry.
 Second Lieut. William Walter Thrall, Finance Department, since retired from active service.
 Second Lieut. Henry Stephen Hostetter, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Charles Burd Eckels, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Wallace Fairchild Baker, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Hardie Ambrose Violland, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Hastie Alexander Stuart, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Eugene Coffin, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Francis Jewett Baker, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Eugene Owen Hopkins, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Elmer Ellsworth Lockard, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Dana Woods Morey, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Seldon Brooke Armat, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. George Zinn Eckels, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Jerome Clark, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Louis Maloney Thibadeau, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Frank B. Shelly, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Clarence Maynard Exley, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Otto Wilhelm Gralund, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Horace Grattan Foster, Finance Department.

Second Lieut. James MacKay, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Thomas Scott Pugh, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Stephen Roscoe Beard, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. George Nicoll Watson, Finance Department, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. Guy Russell Doane, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Emmett Crawford Morton, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Harold George Salmon, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Ed Norment Enders, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Archie Henry Willis, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Edward Tiffin Comegys, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Harrison Willard Smith, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Horace Grant Rice, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Charles Russell Insley, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Ernest Palmer Hoff, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Lute Emmett Collier, Quartermaster Corps, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. Wilhelm P. A. T. Von Hartung, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Montgomery Taft Legg, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. James Asa Marmon, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Walter Davis Dabney, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Percy Gabriel Hoyt, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. William James Lisle, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. William Alexander MacNicholl, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Carl Halla, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Charles Franklin Eddy, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. William Maynard Dixon, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Richard Le Roy Cave, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Alfred James Maxwell, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Orva Earl Beezley, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Frank Elmer Parker, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Edwin Fairbrother Ely, Finance Department.
 First Lieut. Rafael Garcia y Larrosa, Philippine Scouts.
 First Lieut. Carl Archibald Bishop, Philippine Scouts.
 First Lieut. James Ellis Slack, Cavalry.
 First Lieut. Marvin Randolph Baer, Philippine Scouts.
 First Lieut. James Cadmus McGovern, Philippine Scouts.
 First Lieut. Manuel Benigno Navas, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry.
 First Lieut. Enrique Manuel Benitez, Coast Artillery Corps.
 First Lieut. Vicente Nicolas Diaz, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry.
 First Lieut. Andres Lopez, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry.
 First Lieut. Ramon Salvador Torres, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry.
 First Lieut. Modesto Enrique Rodriguez, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry.
 First Lieut. Roy Walton Heard, Philippine Scouts.
 Second Lieut. Arthur A. Padmore, Finance Department, subject to examination required by law, with rank from July 1, 1920.
 First Lieut. Ansel Griggs Wineman, Field Artillery, with rank from July 1, 1920.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

To be colonels with rank from June 4, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Herbert Arthur White, Judge Advocate General's Department.
 Lieut. Col. Beverly Allen Read, Judge Advocate General's Department.
 Lieut. Col. Blanton Winship, Judge Advocate General's Department.
 Lieut. Col. James Jesse Mayes, Judge Advocate General's Department.
 Lieut. Col. Edward Albert Kreger, Judge Advocate General's Department.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from June 4, 1920.

Maj. Gordon Nathan Kimball, Judge Advocate General's Department.
 Maj. Kyle Rucker, Judge Advocate General's Department.
 Maj. Arthur Winton Brown, Judge Advocate General's Department.
 Maj. Willey Howell, Judge Advocate General's Department.
 Maj. William Taylor, Judge Advocate General's Department.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from July 22, 1919.

Maj. Dennis Patrick Quinlan, Judge Advocate General's Department.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

To be colonel.

Lieut. Col. Arthur Walcott Yates, Quartermaster Corps, from June 27, 1920.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

To be captain.

First Lieut. John Harold Veale, Corps of Engineers, from June 11, 1920.

CAVALRY.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. Elmer Lindsley, Cavalry, since retired from active service, from June 17, 1920.

Lieut. Col. William Jefferson Glasgow, Cavalry, from June 19, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Frank Spear Armstrong, Cavalry, from June 26, 1920.

Lieut. Col. John O'Shea, Cavalry, from June 26, 1920.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Maj. Edward Leonard King, Cavalry, from June 17, 1920.

Maj. Samuel Field Dallam, Cavalry, from June 22, 1920.

Maj. William Kelly, jr., Cavalry, from June 23, 1920.

Maj. Henry Charles Whitehead, Cavalry, from June 23, 1920.

Maj. William Dixon Chitty, Cavalry, from June 23, 1920.

Maj. Alfred Eldrekin Kennington, Cavalry, from June 26, 1920.

Maj. Edward Percy Orton, Cavalry, from June 30, 1920.

Maj. Francis Horton Pope, Cavalry, from June 30, 1920.

Maj. George Edward Mitchell, Cavalry, from June 30, 1920.

To be majors.

Capt. David Harmony Biddle, Cavalry, from June 17, 1920.

Capt. William Fredric Holford Godson, Cavalry, from June 21, 1920.

Capt. George William Winterburn, Cavalry, from June 22, 1920.

Capt. Lewis Foerster, Cavalry, from June 22, 1920.

Capt. Lewis William Cass, Cavalry, since retired from active service, from June 23, 1920.

Capt. William Porter Moffet, Cavalry, from June 23, 1920.

Capt. Archibald Francis Commiskey, Cavalry, from June 24, 1920.

Capt. William Albert Cornell, Cavalry, from June 29, 1920.

Capt. James Eiter Shelley, Cavalry, from June 29, 1920.

Capt. Edward Calvert, Cavalry, from June 29, 1920.

Capt. Bruce Palmer, Cavalry, from June 29, 1920.

Capt. James Edmond Fechet, Cavalry, from June 30, 1920.

Capt. Philip Worthington Corbusier, Cavalry, from June 30, 1920.

Capt. Frederick Marion Jones, Cavalry, from June 30, 1920.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Philip Blaine Fryer, Cavalry, from May 29, 1920.

First Lieut. George Hill Carruth, Cavalry, from June 4, 1920.

First Lieut. Arthur Winton Hartman, Cavalry, from June 10, 1920.

First Lieut. Joseph Nixon Marx, Cavalry, from June 17, 1920.

First Lieut. Donald Coe Hawley, Cavalry, from June 18, 1920.

First Lieut. Vernon Lhreau Padgett, Cavalry, from June 21, 1920.

First Lieut. Jay Ward MacKelvie, Cavalry, from June 21, 1920.

First Lieut. Francis Truman Bonsteel, Cavalry, from June 22, 1920.

First Lieut. William Edwin Barott, Cavalry, from June 22, 1920.

First Lieut. Frank Nelson, Cavalry, from June 22, 1920.

First Lieut. Herman Frederick Rathjen, Cavalry, from June 22, 1920.

First Lieutenant Daniel Joseph Keane, Cavalry, from June 23, 1920.

First Lieut. Le Roy Davis, Cavalry, from June 23, 1920.

First Lieut. Anthony John Tittinger, Cavalry, from June 23, 1920.

First Lieut. Max Donald Holmes, Cavalry, from June 24, 1920.

First Lieut. Frank Henry Barnhart, Cavalry, from June 24, 1920.

First Lieut. George Edward Harrison, Cavalry, from June 26, 1920.

First Lieut. Wesley John White, Cavalry, from June 29, 1920.

First Lieut. Alton Wright Howard, Cavalry, from June 29, 1920.

First Lieut. Richard Whitney Carter, Cavalry, from June 29, 1920.

First Lieut. Kenneth Rowntree, Cavalry, from June 30, 1920.

First Lieut. George Archibald King, Cavalry, from June 30, 1920.

First Lieut. Lionel Leopold Meyer, Cavalry, from June 30, 1920.

First Lieut. Frederick Harold Leroy Ryder, Cavalry, from June 30, 1920.

First Lieut. John Waring Weeks, Cavalry, from June 30, 1920.

First Lieut. Theodore Besson Apgar, Cavalry, from June 30, 1920.

First Lieut. Mortimer Heth Christian, Cavalry, from June 30, 1920.

First Lieut. Fabius Busbee Shipp, Cavalry, from June 30, 1920.

FIELD ARTILLERY.

To be majors.

Capt. Sherman Miles, Field Artillery, from May 21, 1920.

Capt. Cortlandt Parker, Field Artillery, from May 21, 1920.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Paul Church Harper, Field Artillery, from June 25, 1920.

First Lieut. George Ross Rede, Field Artillery, from June 26, 1920.

First Lieut. John Cooper Adams, Field Artillery, from June 29, 1920.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. Joseph Wheeler, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from June 22, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Robert Emmet Callan, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 22, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Edwin Landon, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 25, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Clarence Henry McNeil, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 25, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Joseph Powell Tracy, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 27, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Percy Myers Kessler, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 30, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Johnson Hagood, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 30, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Frank Kirby Fergusson, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 30, 1920.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Maj. Alfred Sully Morgan, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 22, 1920.

Maj. Charles Henry Hilton, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 25, 1920.

Maj. William Fayssoux Stewart, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from June 25, 1920.

Maj. Joseph Benjamin Douglas, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 27, 1920.

Maj. Hudson Taylor Patten, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 27, 1920.

To be majors.

Capt. Charles Edward Nason Howard, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 22, 1920.

Capt. Claudius Milton Seaman, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 22, 1920.

Capt. Hugh John Bedell McElgin, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 24, 1920.

Capt. Arthur Leonard Fuller, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 25, 1920.

Capt. Henry Rozer Casey, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 25, 1920.

Capt. William Kern Moore, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 25, 1920.

Capt. David Yulee Beckham, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 25, 1920.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Evan Clouser Seaman, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 5, 1920.

First Lieut. Henry Rasick Behrens, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 19, 1920.

First Lieut. Benjamin Bowering, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 22, 1920.

First Lieut. Henry Fred Grimm, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from June 24, 1920.

First Lieut. Henry Linsert, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 25, 1920.

First Lieut. Donald Langley Dutton, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 26, 1920.

First Lieut. Leland Adrian Miller, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 27, 1920.

First Lieut. Percy Clayton Hamilton, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 27, 1920.

First Lieut. Robert Alexander Laird, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 30, 1920.

To be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Davis Ward Hale, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 4, 1920.

INFANTRY.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. John McAuley Palmer, Infantry, from June 20, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. John Kramer Miller, Infantry, from June 28, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. William Newman, Infantry, from June 28, 1920.
 Lieut. Col. Hansford Lee Threlkeld, Infantry, since retired from active service, from June 29, 1920.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Maj. Thomas McArthur Anderson, jr., Infantry, from June 1, 1920.
 Maj. Charles Du Val Roberts, Infantry, from June 20, 1920.
 Maj. Claude Hamilton Miller, Infantry, from June 28, 1920.
 Maj. Harold Benjamin Fiske, Infantry, from June 29, 1920.
 Maj. John Hendricksen Hughes, Infantry, from June 29, 1920.
 Maj. George Willis Helms, Infantry, from June 29, 1920.
 Maj. Rufus Estes Longan, Infantry, from June 29, 1920.
 Maj. William Mason Fassett, Infantry, from June 29, 1920.
 Maj. Halstead Dorey, Infantry, from June 29, 1920.

To be majors.

Capt. Bertram Page Johnson, Infantry, from June 20, 1920.
 Capt. Charles Ridgely White Morison, Infantry, from June 20, 1920.
 Capt. Walter Lawrence Reed, Infantry, from June 21, 1920.
 Capt. Ira Franklin Fravel, Infantry, from June 23, 1920.
 Capt. Ned Merrill Green, Infantry, from June 28, 1920.
 Capt. James Alfred Moss, Infantry, from June 29, 1920.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Frank Eugene Haskell, Infantry, from June 2, 1920.
 First Lieut. Edwin Howard Clark, Infantry, subject to examination required by law, since retired from active service, from June 10, 1920.
 First Lieut. Crosby Nickerson Elliott, Infantry, from June 14, 1920.
 First Lieut. William Harold Clark, Infantry, subject to examination required by law, since retired from active service, from June 18, 1920.
 First Lieut. Lloyd Davidson Brown, Infantry, from June 18, 1920.
 First Lieut. Roy Carter Hilton, Infantry, from June 20, 1920.
 First Lieut. Raymond Edward O'Neill, Infantry, from June 20, 1920.
 First Lieut. Justin Stanley Hemenway, Infantry, from June 22, 1920.
 First Lieut. William Almond Shely, Infantry, from June 22, 1920.
 First Lieut. John Urban Ayotte, Infantry, from June 23, 1920.
 First Lieut. Charles Heyward Barnwell, jr., Infantry, from June 23, 1920.
 First Lieut. Henry Alfred Schwarz, Infantry, from June 25, 1920.
 First Lieut. Edward George Herlihy, Infantry, from June 26, 1920.
 First Lieut. Arnold John Funk, Infantry, from June 27, 1920.
 First Lieut. George Marvin Ferris, Infantry, from June 28, 1920.
 First Lieut. Edwin Lockwood MacLean, Infantry, from June 29, 1920.

To be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Wesley Collins Dever, Infantry, from June 4, 1920.

PORTO RICO REGIMENT OF INFANTRY.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Arturo Moreno, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry, from May 20, 1920.
 First Lieut. Carlos Manuel Lopez, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry, subject to examination required by law, since retired from active service, from June 20, 1920.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Edgardo Vaquez-Bruno, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry, from April 21, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Virgil Norberto Cordero, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry, from May 20, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Mario Cordero, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry, from June 20, 1920.

MEDICAL CORPS.

To be majors.

Capt. William Daugherty Petit, Medical Corps, from May 23, 1920.

Capt. Jay DePew Mings, Medical Corps, from May 24, 1920.

To be captains.

First Lieut. George Newlove, Medical Corps, from June 4, 1920.

First Lieut. Luke Baker Peck, Medical Corps, from June 4, 1920.

First Lieut. Leonard Philip Bell, Medical Corps, from June 4, 1920.

First Lieut. Frederick H. Sparrenberger, Medical Corps, from June 4, 1920.

First Lieut. George Philip Stallman, Medical Corps, from June 4, 1920.

First Lieut. Magnus J. Myres, Medical Corps, from June 4, 1920.

First Lieut. Ralph Waldo Newton, Medical Corps, from June 4, 1920.

First Lieut. Benjamin Franklin Fridge, jr., Medical Corps, from June 4, 1920.

First Lieut. Carlton Lakey Vanderboget, Medical Corps, from June 4, 1920.

First Lieut. James Brent Anderson, Medical Corps, from June 4, 1920.

First Lieut. Charles Henry Stearns, Medical Corps, from June 4, 1920.

First Lieut. Walter Leland Richards, Medical Corps, from June 4, 1920.

First Lieut. Francis Carrillo Tyng, Medical Corps, from June 4, 1920.

First Lieut. George Randolph Harris, jr., Medical Corps, from June 4, 1920.

First Lieut. Forrest Pitt Baker, Medical Corps, from June 4, 1920.

First Lieut. Jarrett Matthew Huddleston, Medical Corps, from June 4, 1920.

First Lieut. John Newton Merrick, Medical Corps, from June 4, 1920.

First Lieut. Albert Bowen, Medical Corps, from June 4, 1920.

First Lieut. Rae Ellsworth Houke, Medical Corps, from June 4, 1920.

First Lieut. Charles Roland Glenn, Medical Corps, from June 4, 1920.

First Lieut. William Stephen Culpepper, Medical Corps, from June 4, 1920.

First Lieut. Royal Kendall Stacey, Medical Corps, from June 4, 1920.

First Lieut. Frederic Hamilton Thorne, Medical Corps, from June 14, 1920.

First Lieut. James Roy Hudnall, Medical Corps, from June 16, 1920.

First Lieut. John Andrews Rogers, Medical Corps, from June 18, 1920.

First Lieut. Reginald Ducat, Medical Corps, from June 18, 1920.

First Lieut. Guy Blair Denit, Medical Corps, from June 18, 1920.

First Lieut. Charles R. Lanahan, Medical Corps, from June 19, 1920.

First Lieut. Charles Augustus Pfeffer, Medical Corps, from June 20, 1920.

First Lieut. Frank Hernon Chase, Medical Corps, from June 26, 1920.

First Lieut. Edward Raymond Easton, Medical Corps, from July 9, 1920.

First Lieut. Francis Elwood Weatherby, Medical Corps, from July 17, 1920.

First Lieut. Stanley Gibson Odom, Medical Corps, from July 20, 1920.

First Lieut. Alfred Robert Thomas, jr., Medical Corps, from July 23, 1920.

First Lieut. Niels Peter Paulsen, Medical Corps, from July 23, 1920.

First Lieut. Thomas Grant Tousey, Medical Corps, from July 24, 1920.

First Lieut. Harold Augustus Spilman, Medical Corps, from August 4, 1920.

First Lieut. Charles August Stammel, jr., Medical Corps, from August 9, 1920.

First Lieut. William Davies McLelland, Medical Corps, from August 9, 1920.

First Lieut. Wilmer Clayton Dreibelbles, Medical Corps, from August 10, 1920.
 First Lieut. Clive Paul Mueller, Medical Corps, from August 13, 1920.
 First Lieut. Sam Hardeman, Medical Corps, from August 14, 1920.
 First Lieut. Nuckols Thornton Davie, Medical Corps, from August 15, 1920.
 First Lieut. William Eli McCormack, Medical Corps, from August 15, 1920.
 First Lieut. Rees Stephen Lloyd, Medical Corps, from August 16, 1920.
 First Lieut. Zera Exley Bolin, Medical Corps, from August 23, 1920.
 First Lieut. Louis Martin Field, Medical Corps, from August 26, 1920.
 First Lieut. Eugen Gottfried Reinartz, Medical Corps, from August 27, 1920.
 First Lieut. Verner Trenary Scott, Medical Corps, from August 27, 1920.
 First Lieut. Hall Glesnor Van Vlack, Medical Corps, from August 27, 1920.
 First Lieut. Alan Callender Sutton, Medical Corps, from August 27, 1920.
 First Lieut. William Milton Caffee, Medical Corps, from September 14, 1920.
 First Lieut. Horace Tyner Doust, Medical Corps, from September 17, 1920.
 First Lieut. John DuBose Barnwell, Medical Corps, from September 19, 1920.
 First Lieut. Everett LeCompte Cook, Medical Corps, from September 20, 1920.
 First Lieut. Alexander Mileau, jr., Medical Corps, from September 23, 1920.
 First Lieut. Samuel Carlton Gwynne, Medical Corps, from September 24, 1920.
 First Lieut. Ralph Leslie Cudlipp, Medical Corps, from September 27, 1920.
 First Lieut. Gordon Adams Clapp, Medical Corps, from September 29, 1920.
 First Lieut. Virgil Heath Cornell, Medical Corps, from September 30, 1920.
 First Lieut. Theodore Wallace O'Brien, Medical Corps, from October 1, 1920.
 First Lieut. William Charles Munly, Medical Corps, from October 1, 1920.
 First Lieut. Ebner Holmes Inmon, Medical Corps, from October 3, 1920.
 First Lieut. Ernest LeRoy Wilson, Medical Corps, from October 4, 1920.
 First Lieut. George Benjamin Kent, Medical Corps, from October 6, 1920.
 First Lieut. Harry Justin Felch, Medical Corps, from October 13, 1920.
 First Lieut. George William Rice, Medical Corps, from October 8, 1920.
 First Lieut. Robert James Platt, Medical Corps, from October 13, 1920.
 First Lieut. William Ralph Campbell, Medical Corps, from October 13, 1920.
 First Lieut. George Heinrichs Preston, Medical Corps, from October 14, 1920.
 First Lieut. William Campbell Colbert, Medical Corps, from October 14, 1920.
 First Lieut. Joseph William Garrett, Medical Corps, from October 16, 1920.
 First Lieut. Charles Levi Maxwell, Medical Corps, from October 16, 1920.
 First Lieut. Frank Walker Young, Medical Corps, from October 21, 1920.
 First Lieut. John Arthur Keyton, Medical Corps, from October 24, 1920.
 First Lieut. Harold Vincent Raycroft, Medical Corps, from October 29, 1920.
 First Lieut. Roy Farrington Brown, Medical Corps, from October 30, 1920.
 First Lieut. Wesley Cintra Cox, Medical Corps, from October 30, 1920.
 First Lieut. Levy Steven Johnson, Medical Corps, from November 2, 1920.
 First Lieut. Brooks Collins Grant, Medical Corps, from November 10, 1920.
 First Lieut. John Glenwood Knauer, Medical Corps, from November 13, 1920.

First Lieut. Elmer Seth Tenney, Medical Corps, from November 13, 1920.
 First Lieut. Clark Anson Wilcox, Medical Corps, from November 13, 1920.
 First Lieut. Roy Wilford Layton, Medical Corps, from November 16, 1920.
 First Lieut. William Bell Foster, jr., Medical Corps, from November 17, 1920.
 First Lieut. Joe Harold St. John, Medical Corps, from November 20, 1920.
 First Lieut. Paul Moyer Patterson, Medical Corps, from November 27, 1920.
 First Lieut. Chauncey Elmo Dovell, Medical Corps, from November 29, 1920.
 First Lieut. Donald H. Pitts, Medical Corps, from November 30, 1920.
 First Lieut. Edwin Raymond Strong, Medical Corps, from December 2, 1920.
 First Lieut. Henry Jackson Hayes, Medical Corps, from December 6, 1920.
 First Lieut. Edwin Leland Brackney, Medical Corps, from December 8, 1920.
 First Lieut. Lucius Kennedy Patterson, Medical Corps, from December 10, 1920.
 First Lieut. Joseph Wheeler Smith, jr., Medical Corps, from December 12, 1920.
 First Lieut. Rufus Leroy Holt, Medical Corps, from December 13, 1920.
 First Lieut. Alfred Edward Jones, Medical Corps, from December 18, 1920.
 First Lieut. Tate Benton Collins, Medical Corps, from December 19, 1920.
 First Lieut. James Day Edgar, Medical Corps, from January 9, 1921.
 First Lieut. William Kenneth Turner, Medical Corps, from January 15, 1921.
 First Lieut. Rollo Preston Bourbon, Medical Corps, from January 19, 1921.
 First Lieut. John Christopher Woodland, Medical Corps, from January 20, 1921.
 First Lieut. Ernest Jackson Steves, Medical Corps, from January 20, 1921.
 First Lieut. William Stanton Martens, Medical Corps, from January 21, 1921.
 First Lieut. Walter Leslie Perry, Medical Corps, from January 21, 1921.
 First Lieut. Harvey Robinson Livesay, Medical Corps, from January 21, 1921.
 First Lieut. Edmund Anderson Lodge, Medical Corps, from January 21, 1921.
 First Lieut. Raymond Osborne Dart, Medical Corps, from January 23, 1921.
 First Lieut. John Frank Lieberman, Medical Corps, from January 23, 1921.
 First Lieut. John Darlington Nourse, Medical Corps, from January 25, 1921.
 First Lieut. Don Clio Bartholomew, Medical Corps, from January 28, 1921.

DENTAL CORPS.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Edwin Moore-Kennedy, Dental Corps, from June 4, 1920.
 First Lieut. George Magnor Krough, Dental Corps, from June 4, 1920.
 First Lieut. Howard Clayton Feyler, Dental Corps, from June 5, 1920.
 First Lieut. Beverley Morrison Epes, Dental Corps, from June 16, 1920.
 First Lieut. James Henry O'Reilly, Dental Corps, from July 12, 1920.
 First Lieut. George Julian Sibley, Dental Corps, from July 30, 1920.
 First Lieut. James Barto Mann, Dental Corps, from August 5, 1920.
 First Lieut. Herbert Edwin Guthrie, Dental Corps, from August 5, 1920.
 First Lieut. Charles Jefferson Denholm, Dental Corps, from August 7, 1920.
 First Lieut. Joseph Henry Jaffer, Dental Corps, from August 17, 1920.
 First Lieut. William Henry Siefert, Dental Corps, from August 21, 1920.
 First Lieut. James Harold Keith, Dental Corps, from September 7, 1920.

First Lieut. James Jay Weeks, Dental Corps, from September 8, 1920.

First Lieut. Wayne W. Woolley, Dental Corps, from September 8, 1920.

First Lieut. Fernando Emilio Rodriguez, Dental Corps, from September 8, 1920.

First Lieut. Thomas Minyard Page, Dental Corps, from September 8, 1920.

First Lieut. Clyde Wakefield Scogin, Dental Corps, from September 13, 1920.

First Lieut. John Godfrey Urban, Dental Corps, from October 11, 1920.

First Lieut. James Lawrence Olsen, Dental Corps, from November 18, 1920.

First Lieut. Daniel Sumner Lockwood, Dental Corps, from December 11, 1920.

VETERINARY CORPS.

To be colonels.

Veterinarian Gerald E. Griffin, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Veterinarian Charles Douglas McMurdo, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Veterinarian William George Turner, Veterinary Corps, from June 14, 1920.

Lieut. Col. William Vinton Lusk, Veterinary Corps, from December 20, 1920.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Veterinarian William Vinton Lusk, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Veterinarian William George Turner, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Veterinarian Joseph Richardson Jefferis, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Veterinarian Harry Frank Steele, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Veterinarian Ray Jones Standclift, Veterinary Corps, from July 23, 1920.

Veterinarian Coleman Nockolds, Veterinary Corps, from August 10, 1920.

Maj. Robert Vans Agnew, Veterinary Corps, from December 18, 1920.

To be majors.

Veterinarian Ray Jones Standclift, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Veterinarian Coleman Nockolds, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Veterinarian Robert Vans Agnew, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Veterinarian Eugene John Cramer, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Veterinarian Jules Henry Uri, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Veterinarian Henry Wilson Peter, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Veterinarian William Proctor Hill, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Veterinarian John Alexander McKinnon, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Veterinarian Charles Henry Jewell, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Veterinarian William Adalbert Sproule, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Veterinarian John Henry Gould, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Veterinarian Walter Fraser, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Veterinarian Walter Robert Pick, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Veterinarian Andrew Edmund Donovan, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Veterinarian Burt English, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Veterinarian Robert Julian Foster, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Veterinarian George Alexander Hanvey, jr., Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Veterinarian George Albert Lytle, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Veterinarian Robert Cessna Musser, Veterinary Corps, from July 24, 1920.

To be captains.

Assistant Veterinarian Robert Cessna Musser, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Aquila Mitchell, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Wilfred Josiah Stokes, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian James Reid Shand, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Herbert Stephens Williams, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Alfred Lewis Mason, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Thomas Harold Edwards, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Burton Alpheus Seeley, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Edward Patrick O'Connell, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian George Henry Koon, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Ralph Maurice Buffington, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Daniel Buchter Leininger, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Joseph Nourse Hornbaker, Veterinary Corps, from June 28, 1920.

To be first lieutenants.

Assistant Veterinarian Sherman Robert Ingram, Veterinary Corps, from March 1, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian George William Brower, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Allen Chamberlain Wight, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Elwood Luke Nye, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Charles Brenton Dunphy, Veterinary Corps, from June 4, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Robert Payne McComb, Veterinary Corps, from June 22, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Harold Clarke, Veterinary Corps, from July 16, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Daniel Henry Mallan, Veterinary Corps, from July 16, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Louis Goldman Weisman, Veterinary Corps, from July 16, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Everett Cooper Conant, Veterinary Corps, from July 16, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian James Alexander McCallam, Veterinary Corps, from July 16, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Harry John Juzek, Veterinary Corps, from July 16, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian William Henry Dean, Veterinary Corps, from July 16, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Solon B. Renshaw, Veterinary Corps, from July 16, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Horace Zenas Homer, Veterinary Corps, from July 16, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Louis Lathrop Shook, Veterinary Corps, from July 16, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Oscar E. Gladfelter, Veterinary Corps, from July 16, 1920, subject to examination required by law.

Assistant Veterinarian Frank H. Woodruff, Veterinary Corps, from July 16, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian John D. Moore, Veterinary Corps, from July 16, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Will Charles Griffin, Veterinary Corps, from July 16, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Lloyd Clifford Ewen, Veterinary Corps, from July 16, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Charles Oliver Grace, Veterinary Corps, from July 16, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Edward Michael Curley, Veterinary Corps, from July 16, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian James Russell Sperry, Veterinary Corps, from July 16, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Floyd Chauncey Sager, Veterinary Corps, from July 16, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Henry Emil Hess, Veterinary Corps, from July 16, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Vincent Brown Wright, Veterinary Corps, from July 16, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Paul Roberts King, Veterinary Corps, from July 16, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Forest Lee Holycross, Veterinary Corps, from July 16, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian George Leander Richards, Veterinary Corps, from July 16, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Daniel S. Robertson, Veterinary Corps, from July 16, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian George Leslie Caldwell, Veterinary Corps, from September 4, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian George Francis Feazell, Veterinary Corps, from September 4, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Jacob Landes Hartman, Veterinary Corps, from September 4, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Gordon Bancroft Huse, Veterinary Corps, from September 4, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian John H. Kintner, Veterinary Corps, from September 4, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Walter Karl Herbott, Veterinary Corps, from September 4, 1920.

Assistant Veterinarian Arthur Dunlap Martin, Veterinary Corps, from September 4, 1920.

CHAPLAINS.

To be chaplains with the rank of lieutenant colonel.

Chaplain Cephas Caleb Bateman, from June 4, 1920.

Chaplain Walter Marvine, from June 4, 1920.

Chaplain Charles Wright Freeland, from June 4, 1920.

Chaplain John Anthony Randolph, from June 4, 1920.

Chaplain Edmund P. Easterbrook, from June 4, 1920.

Chaplain George Chamberlain Stull, from June 4, 1920.

Chaplain Aldred Adino Pruden, from June 4, 1920.

Chaplain Barton Warren Perry, from June 4, 1920.

To be chaplains with the rank of major.

Chaplain James Lincoln Griffes, from June 4, 1920.

Chaplain John Menifee Moose, from June 4, 1920.

Chaplain Julian Emmet Yates, from June 4, 1920.

Chaplain David Law Fleming, from June 4, 1920.

Chaplain Francis Patrick Joyce, from June 4, 1920.

Chaplain Simon Michael Lutz, from June 4, 1920.

Chaplain Herbert Stanley Smith, from June 4, 1920.

To be chaplains with rank of captain.

Chaplain Alexander Daniel Sutherland, from June 4, 1920.

Chaplain Ignatius Fealy, from June 4, 1920.

Chaplain Haywood Lewis Winter, from June 4, 1920.

Chaplain Thomas Louis Kelley, from June 4, 1920.

Chaplain Adolph John Schliesser, from June 4, 1920.

Chaplain Clifford Lore Miller, from June 4, 1920.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. McCUMBER. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until to-morrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, February 5, 1921, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, February 4, 1921.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I raise the point of no quorum present.

NO QUORUM AT PRAYERS.

The SPEAKER. A few days ago when the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC], before the Chaplain's prayer, raised the point of no quorum the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WATSON] argued that the gentleman from Oklahoma had no right to make it at that stage of the proceedings. The Chair at the time sustained the right of the gentleman from Oklahoma. Since then the Chair has been considering the matter, and has concluded he was mistaken in his decision, and that the Member from Oklahoma has no right to make the point of no quorum before the Chaplain offers prayer.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. One moment. Rule VIII provides that—

The Chaplain shall attend at the commencement of each day's sitting of the House and open the same with prayer.

Obviously that provides that the opening exercise of the House shall be prayer by the Chaplain. The Chair thinks that is not a matter of business, but that it is a matter of ceremony, of devotion, and that its appeal is not to the duty of Members

to hear it but to their sense of reverence. Presence of Members is not compulsory. Rule I provides that the Speaker shall take the chair and call the Members to order, and on the appearance of a quorum cause the Journal to be read. There it specifically says that for the reading of the Journal, which is the first business after prayer by the Chaplain, a quorum shall appear. By indirection that would indicate that the prayer does not require the presence of a quorum, inasmuch as the rule particularly says that it does require a quorum to read the Journal.

The Chair therefore is disposed to think that the offering of prayer by the Chaplain is not business of the House that requires a quorum, and that regardless of any gentleman's sense of reverence or propriety it is not in order to make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The Chaplain will offer prayer.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. ACKERMAN. I move to lay that appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think he is obliged to entertain the appeal, because an appeal from the decision of the Chair is business and the point of no quorum could be made, and that would practically nullify the decision. But inasmuch as this is a new matter, the Chair thinks it will be better for once to entertain the appeal and let the House decide the matter.

If the House sustains the decision of the Chair, he will not entertain such an appeal afterwards on the same question. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ACKERMAN] moves to lay the appeal on the table.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McCLINTIC) there were—ayes 81, noes 2.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I raise the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman makes the point of no quorum, and the Chair will recognize it. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on laying the appeal on the table.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 233, nays 70, not voting 126, as follows:

YEAS—233.

Ackerman	Fish	McAndrews	Shreve
Anderson	Fordney	McArthur	Siegel
Andrews, Md.	Foster	McFadden	Sinclair
Andrews, Nebr.	Frear	McKenzie	Sinnott
Anthony	Freeman	McLaughlin, Mich.	Slomp
Aswell	French	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Smith, Idaho
Ayres	Fuller	McLeod	Smith, Ill.
Bacharach	Gallagher	McPherson	Smith, Mich.
Barbour	Gallivan	MacGregor	Smith, N. Y.
Begg	Glynn	Madden	Snyder
Benham	Godwin, N. C.	Magee	Stedman
Black	Good	Mann, Ill.	Steenerson
Bland, Ind.	Goodykoontz	Mapes	Stephens, Miss
Boies	Graham, Ill.	Martin	Stephens, Ohio
Bowers	Green, Iowa	Michener	Stiness
Brand	Greene, Mass.	Miller	Stoll
Brinson	Griest	Monahan, Wis.	Strong, Kans.
Brooks, Ill.	Griffin	Mondell	Summers, Wash.
Brooks, Pa.	Hadley	Montague	Sweet
Browne	Hamilton	Moore, Ohio	Swindall
Buchanan	Hardy, Colo.	Moore, Va.	Swope
Burdick	Harrell	Moore, Ind.	Tague
Burke	Haugen	Murphy	Taylor, Ark.
Caldwell	Hawley	Nelson, Mo.	Taylor, Tenn.
Campbell, Kans.	Hays	Newton, Minn.	Temple
Cannon	Hernandez	Newton, Mo.	Thompson
Christopherson	Hickey	Nicholls	Tillman
Coady	Hicks	O'Connell	Tilson
Cole	Hoch	O'Connor	Timberlake
Cooper	Hoey	Ogden	Tincher
Copley	Holland	Olney	Towner
Crago	Hull, Iowa	Osborne	Treadway
Cramton	Hutchinson	Overstreet	Valle
Crowther	James, Va.	Padgett	Vestal
Curry, Calif.	Jeffers	Paige	Vinson
Dale	Johnson, S. Dak.	Park	Voigt
Dallinger	Johnson, Wash.	Parker	Volstead
Darrow	Jones, Pa.	Parrish	Walsh
Davis, Minn.	Juhl	Patterson	Walters
Dempsey	Kearns	Pell	Ward
Denison	Keller	Purnell	Wason
Dickinson, Iowa	Kelly, Pa.	Raddcliffe	Weaver
Dominick	Kendall	Rainey, Ala.	Webster
Donovan	Kennedy, R. I.	Ramsey	Whaley
Doremus	Kiess	Ramsey	Wheeler
Doughton	King	Randall, Calif.	White, Kans.
Dowell	Kinkaid	Randall, Wis.	Williams
Drane	Klecza	Ransley	Winslow
Dunbar	Knutson	Reavis	Wood, Ind.
Dunn	Lampert	Reber	Woods, Va.
Dyer	Langley	Reed, N. Y.	Woodyard
Echols	Larsen	Rhodes	Wright
Edmonds	Layton	Ricketts	Yates
Elliot	Lea, Calif.	Ridick	Young, N. Dak.
Esch	Lee, Ga.	Robison, Ky.	Young, Tex.
Evans, Nebr.	Lehibach	Rodenberg	Zihlman
Fairfield	Little	Rogers	
Fess	Longworth	Schall	
Fields	Luhning	Scott	

NAYS—70.

Almon	Connally	Lankford	Rubey
Bankhead	Davis, Tenn.	Lazaro	Sears
Barkley	Dickinson, Mo.	Linthicum	Sherwood
Bee	Drewry	McClintic	Sisson
Bell	Dupré	McDuffie	Smithwick
Benson	Eagan	McKeown	Steagall
Bland, Va.	Evans, Mont.	Major	Stevenson
Blanton	Garrett	Mansfield	Summers, Tex.
Bowling	Howard	Mays	Taylor, Colo.
Box	Huddleston	Milligan	Thomas
Briggs	Hudspeth	Minahan, N. J.	Upshaw
Byrnes, S. C.	Humphreys	Oldfield	Welling
Byrns, Tenn.	Igoe	Phelan	Welty
Caraway	Jacoway	Quin	Wilson, La.
Carss	Johnson, Ky.	Rainey, Henry T.	Wilson, Pa.
Carter	Johnson, Miss.	Rayburn	Wingo
Clark, Mo.	Jones, Tex.	Romjue	
Collier	Lanham	Rouse	

NOT VOTING—126.

Ashbrook	Fisher	Kincheloe	Raker
Bakka	Flood	Kitchin	Reed, W. Va.
Baer	Focht	Kraus	Riordan
Blackmon	Gandy	Kreider	Robinson, N. C.
Bland, Mo.	Ganly	Leshner	Rose
Britten	Gard	Loneragan	Rowan
Brumbaugh	Garner	Luce	Rowe
Burroughs	Goldfogle	Lufkin	Rucker
Butler	Goodall	McCulloch	Sabath
Campbell, Pa.	Goodwin, Ark.	McGlennan	Sanders, Ind.
Candler	Gould	McKinley	Sanders, La.
Cantrill	Graham, Pa.	McKinley	Sanders, N. Y.
Carew	Greene, Vt.	McLane	Sanford
Casey	Hamill	Maher	Scully
Chindblom	Hardy, Tex.	Mann, S. C.	Sells
Clark, Fla.	Harrison	Mason	Sims
Classon	Hastings	Mead	Small
Cleary	Hayden	Merritt	Snell
Costello	Hersey	Moon	Steele
Crisp	Hersman	Mooney	Strong, Pa.
Cullen	Hill	Morin	Sullivan
Currie, Mich.	Houghton	Mott	Tinkham
Davey	Hullings	Mudd	Vare
Dent	Hull, Tenn.	Neely	Venable
Dewalt	Husted	Nelson, Wis.	Volk
Doeling	Ireland	Nolan	Watkins
Eagle	James, Mich.	Oliver	Watson
Ellsworth	Johnston, N. Y.	Perlman	White, Me.
Elston	Kahn	Peters	Wilson, Ill.
Emerson	Kelley, Mich.	Porter	Wise
Evans, Nev.	Kennedy, Iowa	Pou	
Ferris	Kettner	Rainey, John W.	

So the appeal was laid on the table.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. KAHN with Mr. DENT.
 Mr. BUTLER with Mr. STEELE.
 Mr. CHINDELOM with Mr. ASHBROOK.
 Mr. FOCHT with Mr. CANDLER.
 Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. BLAND of Missouri.
 Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. GARD.
 Mr. MASON with Mr. MOON.
 Mr. TINKHAM with Mr. KINCHELOE.
 Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin with Mr. KITCHIN.
 Mr. MUDD with Mr. RIORDAN.
 Mr. IRELAND with Mr. CRISP.
 Mr. BAER with Mr. CANTRILL.
 Mr. SANDERS of Indiana with Mr. WISE.
 Mr. BURROUGHS with Mr. GANDY.
 Mr. GREENE of Vermont with Mr. GARNER.
 Mr. MERRITT with Mr. HASTINGS.
 Mr. ROSE with Mr. CLARK of Florida.
 Mr. HOUGHTON with Mr. MEAD.
 Mr. WILSON of Illinois with Mr. RAKER.
 Mr. PORTER with Mr. FERRIS.
 Mr. SNELL with Mr. FISHER.
 Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania with Mr. CULLEN.
 Mr. PERLMAN with Mr. DOOLING.
 Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. BAKKA.
 Mr. WHITE of Maine with Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina.
 Mr. LUCE with Mr. FLOOD.
 Mr. SANFORD with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
 Mr. MCKINLEY with Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY.
 Mr. WATSON with Mr. SMALL.
 Mr. NOLAN with Mr. SULLIVAN.
 Mr. REED of West Virginia with Mr. CAREW.
 Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. NEELY.
 Mr. LUFKIN with Mr. O'CONNOR.
 Mr. MOTT with Mr. HARRISON.
 Mr. VARE with Mr. BLACKMON.
 Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. CLEARY.
 Mr. KRAUS with Mr. RUCKER.
 Mr. ELSTON with Mr. SIMS.
 Mr. MORIN with Mr. HAYDEN.
 Mr. KREIDER with Mr. DAVEY.
 Mr. SANDERS of New York with Mr. GANLY.
 Mr. PETERS with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.

Mr. HERSEY with Mr. MCKINNEY.

Mr. HULINGS with Mr. MAHER.

Mr. ROWE with Mr. HULL of Tennessee.

Mr. VOLK with Mr. ROWAN.

Mr. SELLS with Mr. WATKINS.

Mr. CLASSON with Mr. SARATH.

Mr. MCCULLOCH with Mr. LESHNER.

Mr. CURRIE of Michigan with Mr. MOONEY.

Mr. EMERSON with Mr. McLANE.

Mr. GOODALL with Mr. HARDY of Texas.

Mr. GOULD with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.

Mr. HILL with Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. HUSTED with Mr. POE.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. MCGLENNON.

Mr. JAMES of Michigan with Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The Chaplain will offer prayer.

Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., pastor of Calvary Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, bless our country. We are the people of Thy hand and the sheep of Thy pasture. Help us to be good. Enrich all lives with higher purposes. Speak to hearts that can not tell their woe. Fill our minds with light, our hearts with peace, and our souls with the spirit of obedience, and look upon us day by day with the eyes of Thy great heart; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent that on Saturday, February 12, Lincoln's birthday, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] may be allowed to address the House for 40 minutes.

And in this connection I desire to make this statement. When this was suggested to me, immediately the thought of the intimate connection of the Yates family with Abraham Lincoln came to my mind. As we all know, our colleague is the son of Gov. Yates, of Illinois, the war governor. The personal, professional, and official connection between Richard Yates and Abraham Lincoln was remarkable. They were born about the same time, they were admitted to the practice of law about the same time. They lived in adjoining counties, Lincoln at Springfield, in Sangamon County, and Gov. Yates at Jacksonville, in Morgan County. They traveled the circuit together as practicing lawyers at that time. They both served in the State Legislature of Illinois, and they both served in Congress here in the fifties. The one was a candidate for President of the United States in 1860, and the other was candidate for governor of Illinois.

It may be stated that they made the campaign together, although it is well known that Lincoln did not leave his front porch. They were in constant consultation during these years. During the war Gov. Yates visited Washington frequently. He was elected to the Senate in 1864, and took his place in 1865, the 4th of March. He was almost daily in consultation with Lincoln until his assassination and death the 14th of April.

It is exceedingly appropriate in view of these things that the son of Gov. Yates, who has himself been governor of the State of Illinois, and who grew up in an atmosphere that was born of the intimacy with the great martyred President of the United States, should deliver this address. I think it is indeed fortunate that we may have an opportunity of hearing from him at this time and on this occasion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. CALDWELL. When the House adjourned yesterday there was a point of order that I had reserved.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to speak under the reservation?

Mr. CALDWELL. Under the reservation.

Mr. Chairman, this is perhaps the last time that I will ever address this wonderful body of wonderful men. I have served as a Member of this House and a member of the Military Affairs Committee for six years. I came here not fully appreciating the Congress of the United States, and I now leave it with a high and exalted idea of what it is and what kind of men compose it.

It is usual that when one is about to retire and undertakes to say anything to his friends in parting that he pick out some leaders on both sides of the House and say nice and complimentary things of them. Nearly all of the distinguished men of this House—that is, those who have been distinguished by their leadership—have from time to time been thus spoken of with the highest degree of praise. I can add nothing to what has been said of these great men, whose friendship I enjoy and whose memory I will ever revere throughout my life. But I am going to depart a little from that. I shall speak of the inconspicuous Members of this House, those who come here every day to perform their duties, who work 16 hours a day 300 days in the year performing their duty. These men are entitled to as high praise as the men who do the most spectacular work.

I am proud to have served as a Member of the Sixty-fourth, Sixty-fifth, and Sixty-sixth Congresses during the time of the great World War, and I am proud to call as a friend every Member of these three great bodies. They were men selected, one out of 225,000 on an average, from every section of our country. Men, newspapers, and critics, from time to time, single out one or more and cast aspersions on them; but, gentlemen, no man makes his entry into this great body, the greatest legislative body in the world, unless there is something to him. Men may say that this Member was selected because of one particular trait of character, and that one for another; but the facts are, and it is demonstrated in close personal association, no Member is elected to this House unless he is of sterling qualities and more than average capacity and ability in his constituency.

I am proud to call them my friends. I want each Member of this House and each resident of my district in years to come to remember me with the same kindly feelings of friendship with which I remember them, and I now extend an invitation to each of you and the folks at home, at any time so long as we live, when you need a friend and you think I can be of service to you, call on me and I will do my best to help you. [Applause.]

I thank you, gentlemen, and the people at home, for the kindness you have shown to me. I want to show my appreciation of it. I am leaving this delightful service to take up one not so delightful but perhaps more lucrative. I am going back to the general practice of law, and in that I hope to be of as great service to my people as I have been here. I have formed a partnership with Hon. George E. Polhemus, until recently an assistant United States attorney in Brooklyn. Our firm name will be Caldwell & Polhemus, and our offices will be at 50 Church Street, New York City, and so, gentlemen, I say au revoir—not good-by—for I will be frequently in Washington attending to legal matters before the departments and shall avail myself of these opportunities to see you. Again, gentlemen, I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL], who has just addressed the committee, represents a northern State, and I come from the far South, where the magnolias bloom. During these six years of my longer service I have been intimately associated with the gentleman from New York in a personal way, and I want to say that I am sure I speak the truth—and certainly the Members of this House who know him well personally will say that I do—when I say that it is with genuine regret upon our part that he leaves this body. CALDWELL is clean, able, and capable; he has strong convictions and high purposes. He is a lawyer of long, successful experience, which accounts for his distinguished success here and before the Government departments.

He is a fair fighter; he never strikes below the belt. He is a genuine friend, lovable and dependable, and I wish to add this expression of general regret that he must voluntarily leave this House, and to assure him that those of us who know him well will follow him with hope and prayers that success may be his heritage, and that his pathway through life shall grow brighter and brighter each day. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York withdraw his reservation of the point of order?

Mr. CALDWELL. I do.

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not want my few remarks to be considered in any sense a valedictory, although, like the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL], I realize that in all probability it will be but a short time when I, too, will be back in that great body of our citizenry who have no right to express themselves on this floor, but who think about what we do here and who pay the bills. I want to say in behalf of the gentleman from New York that I believe, from my knowledge of him, that he meant straight from the heart every word that he said about any one of us calling on him for a friendly act. He is built that way. While I do not agree with many of his ideas and ideals, I know him to be a good friend. [Applause.]

I have risen this morning to call attention to something which took place in the committee yesterday. I want this bill when it is ready to be passed to be in such shape that a self-respecting man who knows something or thinks he knows something of the Military Establishment, with all of its traditions and high ideals, may feel that he can vote for it. Yesterday afternoon I was unexpectedly called to my office to meet a constituent. When I returned to the Chamber the committee was considering an amendment which had been offered providing for the discharge of men who had fraudulently enlisted in the Army of the United States. I wondered that no one had made the point of order when the amendment was offered. I was told, however, that by an agreement it was not subject to the point of order, and much to my surprise the amendment was passed over; and then, to make the matter worse, an amendment to that amendment was adopted, which, in my opinion, is one of the most foolish things ever done by an intelligent body of men. Do not misunderstand me. Year by year as I have associated with the men here I have conceived a higher regard for their judgment and for their honesty and integrity and well-intentioned acts, but I must say that at times there seems to be a spirit which can not be called any other name than "mobocracy," which gets possession of a small group of men in this House when something is called to their attention which appears to them to be wrong, and they swing to the other extreme.

What was done yesterday? If I have the time later, I would like to explain about an enlistment and the meaning of a discharge from the Army of the United States. We in effect here have taken a step which, carried to its logical conclusion, would mean that the Congress of the United States is willing to repeal the Ten Commandments. In the first place, we have said to the Secretary of War, "You must direct an Army officer to certify to a lie," and we have said to the young man who receives that paper, "Although you may go into any court of this country and testify when the matter at stake is human life or property, and your evidence will be taken, yet when you take that most solemn obligation, the oath to defend and support the Constitution of the United States, you may do so with impunity, even though you are tall and strong and able-bodied."

We have not only said that to him, but we have said to every witness who appears before a court-martial that so far as a military oath is concerned the moral and civil law does not apply. What further have we done? We have cast an aspersion upon the honorable discharge held by the man who saw service, or his descendants, in every war in which our country has been engaged. I do not know what there is about the military service which appeals so closely to our hearts, but I say to you that the man who in any war or who at any time has served his country honestly and faithfully, who has received a discharge as such, should not be grouped with the boy 16 or 17 or almost 18 years of age, who has been willing to stand up and swear that he was 18, and whose oath we have said shall not hold him in the service. We have made it possible for a young man in New York City, without fear of any consequence, to misrepresent things to the recruiting officer, to be sent to the Pacific coast, to demand under the language of this amendment pay at the rate of 5 cents a mile from San Francisco back, to bum around San Francisco and do just as he pleases, and then claim the right of being honorably discharged because of his age. We have struck a blow, in my opinion, at the integrity of our moral and legal code.

In spite of the many remarks which have been made derogatory to Army officers, I assert that you will not find any more representative men in this country or any men who entertain higher ideals than do the officers of our Army. [Applause.] Yet the officer who grants the discharge must certify that the

services rendered were "honest and faithful," and are you going to say to him, "You shall certify that this man who stood up and took that false oath performed service which was honest and faithful"?

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAGO. Yes.

Mr. FIELDS. If the soldier should serve on to the expiration of his enlistment, with the same charge against him, then from the gentleman's viewpoint he should be given an honorable discharge?

Mr. CRAGO. But there would be no charge against him, and the officer would take his service for what it is worth.

Mr. FIELDS. Does the gentleman believe that the amendment adopted yesterday would call for an honorable discharge of a man under indictment in the Army?

Mr. CRAGO. It would, if that became a law. Do not misunderstand me. I am not so fearful of this becoming a law, because I know the many means of getting rid of a thing like this.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAGO. Yes.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman does not seriously believe that the amendment we voted yesterday will ever become a law, does he?

Mr. CRAGO. I was going to explain that. There are many ways of getting rid of a thing like that, but do not you see my point? I want to vote for this bill.

Mr. FESS. I do see the point, and I voted yesterday against the amendment.

Mr. CRAGO. I want this bill in such shape that we can all vote for it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAGO. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. A man who enlists under the age of 18 years and serves his term of three years duty and the officer who discharges him knows that he enlisted under 18 years of age, does he then grant him an honorable discharge?

Mr. CRAGO. If he knows it? I can not conceive of a case of that kind unless it came to him confidentially.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Does not the gentleman believe the officers very frequently know that the man in the service was under 18 years of age when he enlisted?

Mr. CRAGO. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois I believe he and other Members here are laboring under a misapprehension when they think that of any officer—I will read the regulations and instructions that are sent to these recruiting officers, which are to the effect that if any officer knowingly accepts a man in the service of the United States whom he has any suspicion and whom he does not feel has fully justified himself as being over 18 years of age is subject to court-martial.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAGO. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman does not answer the question I put because the officer who discharges is not the officer who enlists. Now, if the officer who discharges the man, who has completed his term of service, good service, does the gentleman from Pennsylvania think that the officer is guilty if he discharges a man though he knows that he entered the service under a false affidavit?

Mr. CRAGO. I believe he is certifying to his service and his service is honest.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes; but he does it knowing—

Mr. CRAGO. No. Now, we say to him that because of a fraudulent act we refuse to give him an honorable discharge.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. No; his service is honorable.

Mr. CRAGO. I catch the point of the gentleman.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman made the statement a while ago that the officer is required to certify under the law if he grants an honorable discharge, when, as a matter of fact, all officers do grant honorable discharges for faithful services though they know he entered under age.

Mr. CRAGO. Well, there is very little—

Mr. McKENZIE. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. CRAGO. I do.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is it not a fact that we even went further in that amendment yesterday and provided this boy or soldier could take advantage of his own wrong?

Mr. CRAGO. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. If the gentleman will permit, why should not the War Department regulations prescribe that a

birth certificate shall be furnished instead of accepting the oath of a man who wants to enlist who is under age?

Mr. CRAGO. The regulations do prescribe that, and the only case in which they do not get that is in the case where it is shown the officer that it is physically impossible to obtain it. Now, if I may be allowed to do so I will be glad to insert in the Record these regulations, which are very drastic on this subject, and they are very simple indeed. Now, what happens in the department? For an honorable discharge a testimonial of honest and faithful service, a white discharge certificate is issued, and on that is inscribed the words "service, honest and faithful." On a dishonorable discharge, resulting from court martial, and so forth, a yellow paper is given which simply states the case and under what order of court the man was discharged. The discharge given to a young man who has fraudulently enlisted—and, by the way, if it is illegal to enlist that way he is never really a member of the Army—a discharge given him is this blue-green certificate on which there is no discharge without honor, nothing to indicate why he was discharged except by reason of the fact that he enlisted before he was 18 years of age. There is no such thing issued any more by the War Department as a discharge without honor, and there is nothing in this discharge which is given these boys at the present time which would indicate to anyone other than that he represented himself to be more than 18 years of age.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAGO. I will.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What does the gentleman think ought to be done with these recruiting officers who go around lying to young fellows and getting them to enlist in the Army under false pretenses?

Mr. CRAGO. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri that he may not have heard what I said here before, that they have the most stringent regulations placed in the hands of these officers, and any officer who does not follow those instructions explicitly and satisfies himself beyond the shadow of a doubt that this man is 18 years of age is subject to court-martial.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Has anyone been court-martialed?

Mr. CRAGO. I do not know anything about that. I say I think there is a good bit of false sentimentality aroused in this matter of boys 16, 17, and 18 years of age; why, the great wars of the country have been fought by boys of that age, and boys of that age have commanded companies, regiments, and brigades.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAGO. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. Col. McIver in yesterday's Record has a letter stating that one Dudley was discharged at Fort Slocum, and has been held there since January 16 because he had no funds to pay his way home.

Mr. CRAGO. The gentleman should not believe everything he sees in the press.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman just stated that the Army officer was a very worthy man, and it comes from a colonel in the Army. But he is the man himself who has provided these regulations, and I will say to the gentleman there is such a thing in the Army as discharge without honor.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. WINGO. The suggestion is made that the House on yesterday went through a hollow performance and made a false statement of its position by adopting the amendment offered by me authorizing an honorable discharge to boys who misstate their age at time of enlistment. Well, if it is reprehensible for a boy of immature years, in his eagerness to get into the Government service, to make a misstatement of his age, criticism of him comes with poor grace from Members of Congress who confess they have taken part in a hollow sham and adopted an amendment which they say the majority of the House will repudiate by parliamentary legerdemain.

Mr. CRAGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. I have not the time. The gentleman says there is a lot of maudlin sentimentality about this question. Well, I have studied boys, both as a school-teacher for four years, as a father, and as a citizen realizing that the future of our country rests upon the character of boys, shaped while they are boys, and I know, as every thoughtful man knows, that maintaining the pride and arousing the ambition is the safest course; and when you magnify any act of a boy that he has thoughtlessly committed, without any immoral or immoral intent, and try to make him believe that he is anything but clean and square you destroy or weaken the best safeguard he has.

When you give one of these fine impulsive boys a discharge other than an honorable one you make it possible for some other boy to taunt him by saying, "Oh, I have an honorable discharge, but you have not." Some men are incapable of realizing the damage done by such a situation.

But gentlemen throw up their hands in mock horror and say, "but you force an Army officer to make a false statement by requiring him to certify to a good record in the service when the soldier has a bad record, simply because he is guilty of fraudulent enlistment." That is pure sophistry for two reasons:

First, you do not require the officer to do anything but obey the law by giving a certain kind of discharge in a given case. Congress and not the officer decides the effect of a given act; second, the boy's record in the service is not bad simply because before his service commenced, and in order to get in the service, he misstated his age. The words "fraudulent enlistment" sound big, but measured by the true test is unfair. No criminal intent, no serious fraudulent motive prompts the boy, but immature, thoughtless, he thinks only of his desire to get in, and regards the age limit as simply a mere technical bar to his service to his country. His intent is not to defraud but to serve. Oh, gentlemen, there is a clear distinction between a deliberate misstatement of a material fact by a grown, mature man, with intent to defraud, and the thoughtless misstatement of age by an impulsive anxious boy.

If a simple misstatement of one's age damns the soul and taints us with fraud, and puts the brand of dishonor on our records, then the great majority of us will have to share the fate of Kipling's old Gunga Din, and with him spend eternity—

Squatting on the coals
Givin' drink to pore damned souls.

The fact is, in most instances the recruiting officer is told by the boy his correct age, but the boy being strong, large, and a splendid type, or the officer being anxious to get a recruit, enters on the papers a misstatement as to age, and the boy signs it without ever reading—just "signs his name on the dotted line."

Subsequently, if the matter comes up on an application for discharge on account of under-age enlistment the officer will not admit he has violated instructions and regulations, and the boy is solemnly told he has been guilty of fraudulent enlistment and made to feel he is a criminal.

I recall one case. The boy was a big, strapping lad, but under age. He told the officer the truth but urged his physical strength and development as being equal to and, in fact, superior to many of enlistment age. The papers were filled out and signed by the boy without reading. His mother appealed to me, but I insisted on his being retained. Finally the armistice was signed and he wanted a discharge and to spend Christmas with my family, which was the same as home to him, because I held him as a babe in my arms as his father lay dying and had promised to ever "stand-by" as a father. When I took up the matter I was gravely advised that the boy had committed a grievous offense in that he had misrepresented his age in order to enlist. Well, I knew the lad, I knew that while he might thoughtlessly and without bad intent misstate his age, yet—

He couldn't lie if you paid him,
And he'd starve before he stole.

The boy contended he told the officer his age, and subsequently the officer admitted the facts, but said the boy was so anxious and begged so hard he took him. I did not condemn the officer. I suspect I should have done the same.

The way to stop these so-called fraudulent enlistments is for the department to give the recruiting officers to understand they must rigidly adhere to the age limit.

The most vicious thing about the present practice in these cases is the spirit it arouses. Let a thoughtless, impulsive boy, anxious to get in the Army, misstate his age and enlist without his parents' consent and then when his mother begs for his discharge he is charged with fraud and discharged far away from home with the stigma of being denied an honorable discharge. You arouse in the soul of the immature boy a feeling not conducive to loyal citizenship and in the heart of the mother an outraged feeling of fear and contempt. Compared to these the few paltry dollars involved sink into insignificance.

Be careful how you charge youth with fraud. Let not a free Government blot his record and break his pride with a charge of dishonor save when the act is serious and material and deliberately done with a fraudulent intent. [Applause.]

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to offer any objection to the request for time, but after this I intend to ask that the debate be confined to the paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. This is an important matter. I want some time on the question. The gentlemen will get along much faster.

Mr. FIELDS. I think this matter should be cleared up, and I trust the gentleman from Kansas will not do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE].

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I always find great pleasure in listening to my colleague and comrade, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAGO]. Twenty-two years ago to-day there began in Manila a war which rescued from misrule and barbarism 7,000,000 of people and brought to this country an empire beyond the sea. The gentleman from Pennsylvania and I heard the first roll of the first drums of that war. I like to agree with him, but I can not always do it. He criticizes the feeling of "foolish sentiment," as he calls it, which shows some manly, mature appreciation of the mentality and mental attributes of a boy who so loves his country that he is willing to lie about his age in order to get into the Army. I know a little boy myself whom, when this war began, attempted to volunteer, though much under age. He never did anything of which I am as proud as that. So I differ a little from the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CRAGO. The gentleman will surely yield to me—

Mr. LITTLE. I did not interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. CRAGO. The gentleman surely did not catch from my remarks that I cast reflection on such a boy.

Mr. LITTLE. I decline to yield.

The records of the Civil War are gemmed and starred with the declarations of young men who could have stayed at home, but who went out, as he tells us, with a lie on their lips, to the battles of their country. Thousands of them received honorable discharges from our Army into the great beyond at Gettysburg, Antietam, Vicksburg, Pea Ridge, Wilsons Creek, Franklin, and Nashville. If they had seen it through, would they have been mustered out, scorned through all time with a charge of fraudulent enlistment because of going in under age?

If there is anything in his logic, which he endeavors to explain, it is the theory that the boy who tells a lie in order to get into a fight for his country should be sent out with dishonor after he has fought for his country. His service might stretch across three years of vallant, bold, and brilliant daring, as it has often done, and yet they would say to him when the roar of the guns of Chattanooga had died from his ears, "You are discharged without honor."

In 1861 a little boy, 10 years old, who lived next door to my father—and I was a baby then—went off to battle. He was 10 years of age. Before he was 13 he was enlisted. Before he was 14 Gen. George H. Thomas, on the battle field of Chickamauga, made him a sergeant in the Army of the United States, because he had shot down a Confederate colonel in battle. He took him on his knee and started him on the road to fame. Gen. Grant made him a cadet at West Point, and the other day Maj. Gen. John Clem, the drummer boy of Chattanooga, who enlisted at 13 years of age, visited me and referred to the days of his youth. I never had a higher honor than his visit. Yet he went into the war, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania would say, with a lie on his lips. What kind of a lie?

Once there was a great king, a very cruel king, who feasted while the people famished. For some reason he issued a decree that nothing should be done to assist them. The queen was a beautiful and gracious and Christian woman. She made it her sole purpose in life to see that food was conveyed to the starving people. One day the king heard of this and issued a decree that any person who fed them should die. Presently she was out again with baskets full of loaves of bread, with her maids to distribute them, and the king came along. They threw their aprons across the baskets, so that the loaves of bread should not appear. He rode up and demanded to know what was in those baskets. The queen, a lovely Christian woman, who had never told a lie in her life, said, "Roses, sire." He said, "Take off the covers." She did, and the good Lord had turned the loaves of bread into roses and saved her life and blessed that lie.

It was a good lie. There was never a better lie told than that of the little lad who goes out to die for his country with the jest on his lips, as he calls it, about his age. My gallant comrade from the Tenth Pennsylvania never really means that. No soldier who fought as well as my colleague from Pennsylvania did in the Philippines would change a virtue into a crime and mark it up against that boy's record, which will shine like a star down the generations. I do not understand how that could be done. It was a good lie, gentlemen. You let the little boy alone, gentlemen. The good God knows just what to do with that boy, and that boy suits the good God fine. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks leave to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCLINTIC. I hope the gentleman will modify his request to a revision; otherwise I shall have to object.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. LITTLE. If the gentleman from Oklahoma wants to object, let him object.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma objects.

Mr. BLANTON rose.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I want to inquire, Mr. Chairman, when there will be a propitious time for recognizing members of the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is trying to recognize the Members on the different sides. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, this was a very important matter yesterday when the membership by a vote of 48 to 32 adopted this amendment; but it has become unusually important since the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAIG] intimates that it is to be ruthlessly set aside and stricken from the bill. It is not as important as if the gentleman were a mouthpiece of his party, because he is not, but it has become specially important since the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], who is a distinguished leader of his party, being its congressional chairman, took the floor and said that it was inadvertently done; that it was wrongfully done; that the amendment should not have passed; and that no serious-minded person in the House—and I presume he referred to all the Republicans—would think of permitting this amendment to stand as the law of the land. That makes it important before the people of this Nation, as it initiates Republican policy.

What was this amendment that was adopted by a vote of 48 to 32? It was simply the proposition that henceforth the Secretary of War must issue an honorable discharge to young men 15, 16, or 17 years of age who, because of the slick-tongued recruiting officer and the blandishments that have been handed out and the flowery pictures of Army life that have been put before the young boys through the \$550,000 worth of advertising that the Secretary of War has done during the last year to get the youth into the Army, represents his age to be 18 years in order to enlist; that when that youth's mother or father files an application for his discharge because of his minority the Secretary of War must give him an honorable discharge, and must send him home and must pay his way, and he must not forfeit the pay he has earned while he has been in the Army.

That is the proposition that the distinguished leader of the Republican Party says the dominant Republican Party in this House is not going to stand for. I want the mothers of the country to know what is in the mind of the gentleman from Ohio as a leader of his party. The mothers of the country are not going to stand for the dominant party's policy, if that is your policy.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In a moment. What wrong has the boy done? "Oh," the gentleman from Pennsylvania said, "you will permit the youth to take advantage of his own wrong." Does not the law of the land do that every day outside of Army matters? You let a mature Congressman make a contract with a minor respecting his property rights and overreach him by taking his property; when that minor becomes of age the law says he can go into court and make him pay it back to him. It allows him to take advantage of his minority, because the law says when you deal with a minor you deal at your own risk. Your contract is not good when he sees fit to set it aside after he becomes of age.

I want to say that this amendment is the best part of the whole bill. I am glad that the gentleman has shown to the country that these 42 votes that put the amendment on the bill are Democratic votes, because, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAIG] would intimate, they were not Republican votes, hence intimating that the 32 votes against the amendment were Republican votes. I am glad the amendment was passed by Democratic votes.

Mr. CURRY of California. They were not all Democratic votes.

Mr. BLANTON. I know. You have some good Republicans who have hearts in their bosoms on your side, and they are not going to let the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Pennsylvania whip them into line and take that vote away from the mothers of the country. You gentlemen are not going to do it. The gentleman from Ohio can crack his Republican whip and can use his position and membership here, as did the gentleman from Pennsylvania, to try to get them into line; but we

know what the mothers and fathers of this country are going to do with the dominant Republican Party if you set that amendment aside. They want to get their boys home. They are holding you responsible for them. The War Department had no right to hold those boys against the wishes of their parents.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SNYDER. Just a moment ago the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] claimed the right to the floor on account of being a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I desire to ask the Chairman whether or not the members of the Appropriations Committee, other than those who serve on the subcommittee that reports the bill, have the prior right of recognition?

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands it there is no preference in recognition given by the rules to members of the committee having in charge the bill under consideration. It has become the custom of the House to give a limited degree of preference to members of the committee responsible for the conduct of the bill and that custom is generally respected by the presiding officer. The present occupant of the chair has endeavored to do that as far as practicable, but does not feel the compelling force of any rule to cause him to do so. The Chair will now recognize the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] if he desires to be recognized.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment to the clause under consideration. On page 26, line 9, I move to strike out the word "purchase" and the comma immediately following it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOOD of Indiana: Page 26, line 9, strike out the word "purchase" and the comma.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, my reason for offering this amendment is to save money to the Treasury. The War Department has more typewriters than they have places to store them, and there is no necessity for their purchasing typewriters. If that word "purchase" is stricken out, perhaps it will be the means of getting some of the typewriters used that are now in cold storage. That is all I desire to say.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman from Indiana a question.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ANTHONY. What is his purpose in striking out the word "purchase"?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. In order that the War Department, which has thousands of these typewriters of every character and description, from the little Corona up to the mammoth extension typewriter, may not be purchasing more machines when they have so many already. They have them now wherever they have a depot of supplies. They have got thousands of typewriters in this town that have never been uncrate from the time they were bought, some of them having been purchased after the war was over.

Mr. ANTHONY. If the gentleman will yield, I will state to him that none of the \$10,000 provided in this clause is intended for the purchase of new typewriters. It is intended for the repair of typewriters on hand.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Then let us strike out the word "purchase." If the word "purchase" is retained they will have a perfect right to purchase more machines, and they will exercise that right if they have it. There is no question about that.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. ANTHONY. It was stated that there might be some special type of typewriter, like one of these double-barreled bookkeeping machines, that they might want to buy one or two of them, and for that reason we left the language in the bill.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That is an additional reason why it should be stricken out. They have got up a new model now that they are trying to foist upon the Government, and there is always some inducement and somebody can be easily induced to buy these newfangled things. We have every conceivable typewriter that is practical for use in these various departments, and it is simply a useless waste of money to permit them to purchase machines when they have so many.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I was informed yesterday by a Member that he went down to the purchase division of the War Department and found they had over 8,000 typewriters now offered for sale, and I am of the opinion that this amend-

ment should be adopted, because they apparently want to sell those typewriters so they can buy new ones.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. If this word "purchase" is not stricken out, you may depend upon it that instead of using the typewriters which they have stored all over this country wherever they have storehouses, they will exhaust this entire item in purchases rather than in repairs.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Did I understand the gentleman to say that they now have typewriters in storage that have never been unpacked?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. They have typewriters in storage that have never been unpacked. I know where there are hundreds of them right in this town that have never been unpacked. They are in the very boxes in which they came from the manufacturer.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Following out the suggestion made by the gentleman from Indiana, would it not be well also to strike out the word "exchange," because this furnishes a basis for securing new machines in exchange?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; I do not think the word "exchange" should be stricken out, for the reason that many of these machines become old and perhaps practically useless, and they can exchange them for these other machines which they have. This does not mean exchange with the company.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. But that would not be an exchange at all. They have both the old ones and the new ones, and no question of exchange would arise. The word "exchange" here would authorize them to turn in an old machine to the company that manufactures them and exchange it for a new one and pay the difference in price between the old one and the new one.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; they will have to turn it in to the committee on supplies. That is what they will have to do.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. But that would not be a question of exchange as the word is ordinarily used.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. A few days ago I was very much interested in the speech which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] made on the floor of the House, in which he charged that the War Department and the Government had purchased 2,000,000 typewriters. A day or two afterwards I listened to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER], who charged that the gentleman from Indiana was wrong, that the gentleman from New York had investigated and found that the Government had purchased only 200,000. What has the gentleman to say as to that?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. If the gentleman was present at that time, he will remember that I corrected my statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. I did not hear the gentleman do that.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I did make the correction. I was in error and so stated, that it was 200,000, 150,000 more than they had any use for.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I want to say that the statement that we have purchased 2,000,000 machines went out through the newspapers of the country, and particularly was so stated in the newspapers of Baltimore, and moreover it said a place had been located where there were 500,000 stored. No mention was made of the correction which the gentleman says he made and the people believe that they purchased 2,000,000 typewriters.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Unfortunately I have no control over the newspapers of the country.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the word "exchange" and the comma following.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska: Strike out the word "exchange" and the comma following.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to the Chair that this is not an amendment to the amendment; it is an entirely separate amendment and would be in order after the other amendment is disposed of.

Mr. FIELDS. I desire to be heard on the amendment.

Mr. ANTHONY. Does the gentleman want to speak on the amendment?

Mr. FIELDS. No; I do not.

Mr. ANTHONY. Then, would it not be better to let us first dispose of this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I have just come in, and, as a distinguished gentleman from Georgia once said, I do not know "where we are at."

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is to strike out the word "purchase."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word about the typewriter matter. The \$10,000,000 is safeguarded, so that there is going to be no typewriters purchased under this appropriation. The department asked for \$20,000 for the maintenance and repair of typewriters. We only gave them \$10,000. The Quartermaster Department states that there are 54,000 typewriters, and 6,000 of them are declared surplus and have gone into the surplus property department. Undoubtedly many more of the 54,000 should be declared surplus and sold, and probably will be, but it should be obvious to the House that as for the \$10,000, none of it is going to be spent for the purchase of typewriters. It is not good sense to destroy the language of the bill when there is no necessity for it.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman from Indiana used the word "foist." I do not know what that means with reference to the purchase of typewriters. Under the \$10,000 does the gentleman think that any company manufacturing typewriters could foist them upon the department?

Mr. ANTHONY. As I have already stated, it is an unnecessary alarm.

Mr. SNYDER. I want to say that if I thought it was going to open up any avenue for the purchase of typewriters for the department I would be for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOOD of Indiana) there were 34 ayes and 13 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I now offer the amendment which I offered a moment ago.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 26, line 9, strike out the word "exchange" and the comma following.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, we have amended by striking out the word "purchase," and in order to make it perfect we must strike out the word "exchange" and the comma, because under this language in appropriation bills the department could buy new machines, and under this word "exchange" they could buy new machines and turn in these old machines in part payment. That would enable them to use any old broken-down machine and turn it in for such a price as might be agreed upon and get an entirely new machine and pay for it out of the \$10,000. If the committee desired that the \$10,000 shall be retained for repairs of typewriters, it should so state. Under the language of the bill they could buy new machines up to the value of \$10,000. Under the word "exchange" they could use the \$10,000 and pay whatever allowance might be agreed upon between the old machines and the new machines, and the effect would be exactly the same. So striking out the word "purchase" leaves the necessity of striking out the word "exchange" also and inserting words that would apply to the repairs only of typewriters.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska) there were 12 ayes and 27 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 22, after the word "sold," strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following:

"Provided further, That hereafter when, in the opinion of the Quartermaster General, it is in the interest of the United States so to do, he is authorized to enter into contracts or to incur obligations for fuel in sufficient quantities to meet the requirements of one year without regard to the current fiscal year, and payments for supplies delivered under such contracts may be made from funds appropriated for the fiscal year in which the contract was made, or from funds appropriated, or which may be appropriated for such supplies during the ensuing fiscal year."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of criticism of the War Department on account of the high prices

it pays for coal. I think the hearings before the Senate Reconstruction Committee show that in some way extravagant prices have been paid in the purchase of coal. I find on page 503 of the hearings on this appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1922, Mr. ANTHONY asked the following question: "What was the increase in the price of bituminous coal in the present year over the year before?" To which Gen. Rogers replied, "During the present fiscal year 125 per cent more has been paid for bituminous coal than in the prior year and 25½ per cent more for anthracite coal." The War Department, or rather Quartermaster General Rogers, suggested that the provision which I have offered as an amendment be put into the bill in order that the War Department might make a contract for the purchase of coal at that season of year when the coal operators enter into contracts with their employees. In other words, at the time of the year when it would be most advantageous to the Government to make contracts for coal.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. Sisson. I am quite in sympathy with the gentleman's amendment. I understand the reason for it, but has the gentleman considered the question of whether or not under his amendment those authorized to purchase coal might not bind the Government beyond the limit of the appropriation. For instance, we appropriate six months before the money is available. If the gentleman's amendment safeguards that possibility, so that they can not spend more money than Congress appropriates, it is good business, and the amendment ought to be agreed to.

Mr. BLACK. I will say to the gentleman that I took it for granted that Senator CALDER, who himself wrote this amendment, has taken into consideration that matter, and therefore I have not done so.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Does the gentleman know whether the language of the amendment is the same as that of a proposed Calder amendment in the Senate?

Mr. BLACK. Except that I have stricken out the words "forage" and "subsistence" and "clothing," because I do not think the hearings disclose any reason why those should come in.

Mr. ANTHONY. Otherwise the language is the same?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. The committee considered the amendment in its consideration of the bill. The reason we did not attach it to the bill is because it is new legislation, and out of deference to the legislative committee. I have no objection to it. It is really very meritorious, and I shall not make the point of order.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear the gentleman say that, because I believe that we are losing not hundreds of thousands of dollars, but probably a million or two dollars a year because of the excessive price of coal, and we ought to stop it. One thing that is causing the present business depression in the United States to-day is the lopsided readjustment that we are experiencing. We see the producers of cotton and corn and wheat and oats selling their products far below the cost of production, and yet we have coal, for example, selling all over the country at more than it sold for during the war period.

Mr. LINTHICUM. How does the gentleman's amendment propose to cure that evil?

Mr. BLACK. It proposes to give the War Department a wider latitude, and to enable them to practice what a good business man practices, and that is to make a contract at that period of the year when the operators of the mines make their contracts with their labor, and I am sure that it will result greatly to the advantage of the Government. I am quite sure that Senator CALDER gave the matter very thorough investigation, because it was he who drew the amendment which I have suggested.

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. EDMONDS. The coal contracts are made generally on the 1st day of April. How would the gentleman propose at the end of the year, the appropriation having run out, to pay for those contracts afterwards?

Mr. BLACK. This amendment provides that they may make the contract for the expenditure not only as to the appropriation for that current fiscal year in which the contract is made but out of the appropriation that is to follow, so that it would be really a live contract.

Mr. EDMONDS. Does the gentleman think they would get a good price on the contract when they do not know whether sufficient money is going to be appropriated in the next fiscal year to meet the contract?

Mr. BLACK. I think so. I think the amount of the contract would be made within the limit of the appropriation available, and therefore there would be no doubt about payment.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman's amendment, for example, would permit this money to be available for that contract in April, although the bill does not go into effect until July, and coal might not be delivered until it is needed in the fall. It simply enables the War Department to purchase the coal at the most advantageous time, and then after the 1st of July the money becomes available.

Mr. EDMONDS. I think that is a very good amendment.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman rise to discuss the amendment?

Mr. FESS. The point of order has been reserved, as I understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas has withdrawn the point of order.

Mr. FESS. So that the time for making the point of order has passed?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The gentleman from Kansas withdrew the point of order, and the gentleman from Texas proceeded to debate the point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise to address myself to the amendment. Does not this proposition foreshadow a policy of authorizing the heads of departments to make contracts in advance of the allowance of appropriations by Congress for specific purposes?

Mr. BLACK. No; I think not. The language of the amendment, if the gentleman will follow it, is as follows:

Provided, That hereafter when, in the opinion of the Quartermaster General, it is in the interest of the United States so to do, he is authorized to enter into contracts and to incur obligations for fuel in sufficient quantities to meet the requirements for one year, without regard to the current fiscal year.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that the argument can be made, and there will be a disposition to use it, that this establishes a precedent which would induce the heads of departments to entertain, in their judgment, the existence of an exigency for contracts for any line of supplies that might be suggested.

Mr. BLACK. But this is limited to coal.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I understand it is limited to coal, but upon that as a precedent, they may come forward and apply it to other things.

Mr. BLACK. If it would be advisable and good business as to other articles, Congress ought not to oppose a good business arrangement.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I think that while we recognize the wisdom of an action of this sort, which would be exercised by a business man in his private affairs, we will find this will be a precedent which will be urged very strongly by executive branches of the service for the enlargement of this privilege to a wide range of business.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I will.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Would the gentleman object to that if it safeguards the Government?

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I am not going to vote against the amendment; I am simply calling attention to what I believe will be the tendency in the establishing of this precedent. I know full well that this matter is urged again and again and where you can find examples in the law that executive branches of the services will cite it as authority for paying bills. I could go over the records and call hundreds of examples where executive branches of the Government have called upon the accounting officers to certify bills beyond the limit of the appropriation just on a precedent like this, and they are bound to use it. I recognize an occasional advantage as in this instance, but I am simply calling attention to phraseology of this sort in an appropriation bill. I know that all executive branches of the service will be quite prompt to urge it as a precedent for questionable expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Mr. Chairman, I do this for just a moment to call attention to the proposition that was under discussion a while ago in regard to blue discharges. In this connection the Secretary of the Interior has ruled that an ex-soldier with a blue discharge can not have the advantage of the public-land laws—that is, the privilege of filing on the public lands under the soldiers' act, which permits soldiers who saw service to file on public lands and have the benefit of their length of service in acquiring

title to the land to secure a home. I have in mind a boy who had filed on land prior to the time of his entering the Army. He went across the sea and saw service. After the armistice was signed, he, having a clear record up to that time, went A. W. O. L., and was given as a result a blue discharge. The Secretary of the Interior held that he could not have the benefit of securing a patent to the public land of the United States on which he had filed previous to the time he had entered the Army simply because he had a blue discharge.

Mr. MADDEN. He could obtain patent, but he could not get credit for his time?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I thank the gentleman—he could not get the credit for his time, which was equivalent to saying he could not secure a patent to the land, although the boy had served two years and six months in the Army.

Mr. EDMONDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I cite that as just one of the things that show a blue discharge is not the equivalent to an honorable discharge. That is one of the many things that might arise, and you will find in your experience that when a man has a blue discharge he will face many problems in the future in which the blue discharge will rise up to curse him. Now, I do not believe that a young man who had the patriotism to volunteer and wanted to serve his country ought to be penalized as against the boy who does not have that ambition and that desire.

Mr. EDMONDS. Do I understand the gentleman is advocating a premium for desertion?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I do not advocate a premium for desertion, neither do I desire to put a penalty on the young man who has patriotism. But you take a boy who entered the Army when he was 16 or 17 years of age perhaps expecting to go in and serve his country—as many of them did at the time when the war spirit was on—who thought the great big thing was to take care of the United States Government in its crisis—the land he loved—it seems a tragedy to kick him out with a blue discharge. At the time he went in it did not seem to him an important matter to deceive about his age—it did not affect the fact that he was patriotic and much more patriotic than many of those who did not enter. And yet you would put a penalty on that boy by classing him as guilty of dishonorable conduct, practically because I submit there is very little difference in effect between the blue discharge and a dishonorable discharge.

Now, I do not claim that all these discharges should be honorable ones.

I really believe we are going at this matter backward. It seems that a better plan would be to direct all recruiting officers, in all cases of doubt, to require the applicant for enlistment to furnish either a birth certificate or the affidavit of one of his parents or his legal guardian to the effect that he is of sufficient age to join the Army. This would correct the matter at the source.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. Sisson and Mr. SUMNERS of Texas rose.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have been appealing for recognition at least a dozen times.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is a member of the committee, and the Chair recognizes him.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the committee briefly to the item which we now have under discussion, and I move to strike out the last three words if necessary. The item which we are discussing is on page 27, several pages there, and the last item is an item which authorizes the Secretary of War to sell certain mules and horses which we have on hand. Now, I picked up yesterday a newspaper which gives you a little light on the reason why the committee thought this item ought to go in the bill. I read from the News and Observer, of Raleigh, N. C., under date of February 1, 1921:

Thirty-three horses and mules were found to have died of suffocation as a result of being packed in unventilated, closed box cars when a shipment of 185 Government animals arrived in Raleigh Sunday morning en route from Camp Lee, Va., to Camp Jackson, S. C. The animals are said to have been first-class stock.

According to railroad officials, the animals were loaded in 11 tightly closed box cars, contrary to the almost universal practice of transporting animals in semiopen cars, by direction of a captain in the Quartermaster Corps of the United States Army, who is said to have expressed the desire that the animals be kept warm.

The shipment left Petersburg Saturday night in charge of Pvt. H. Adams, accompanied by another soldier and two civilians. According to statements made by the party, examination of the cars en route showed that the animals were suffering. An attempt was made to unload the cars at Norfolk, but no facilities were available, and the cars were brought on to Raleigh, after the cars had been partly opened.

On arrival at Raleigh it was found that the opening of the cars had saved the bulk of the animals, but 18 horses, occupying one car, and 15 mules, which made up the cargo of another car, were discovered to be dead.

Dr. L. F. Koonce, well-known Raleigh veterinarian, was called upon to make an examination of the dead animals, and could discover no cause of death further than suffocation. Dr. Koonce stated that one of the cars containing the dead animals was practically new, and that the other car was in very good condition, and is inclined to the opinion that this circumstance is responsible for the fact that animals died in only two of the cars.

The dead animals were yesterday taken to the city abattoir in order to salvage the hides, and the entire shipment was held in Raleigh overnight in order that attention might be given the other animals.

Now, I call the attention of the committee to the fact that with the thousands of animals owned we are taking just that sort of chance. Why, we do not need them. We are feeding them. We have men to care for them, and it requires a great deal of feed; something like a dollar a day, I believe, is about the estimate it takes, with the help, to take care of a horse; and these men, who know as little about shipping cattle and horses as was shown in this case, where they put a carload of horses in a closed car, might have known the horses would suffocate. There is hardly a farmer in the country who does not know better than to put a carload of animals in a closed car, and it simply shows that the people who have charge of the horses and the mules when you have too many of them do not take proper care of them. The record does not show why they shipped them from one place to another, but it shows that 33 Government horses died in one single shipment because of the ignorance on the part of the people caring for the horses.

I wanted to call the committee's attention to that fact, to show that these horses that are not needed ought to be sold as quickly as possible and the Government relieved of the expense of caring for them and whatever money can be gotten out of the sale of the horses go into the Treasury.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and pending amendments close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and pending amendments close in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I would like five minutes.

Mr. ANTHONY. On the paragraph?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. On the question of enlistments.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think we had best close the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] is recognized.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in sympathy with the purpose of the amendment adopted yesterday and which has been under discussion. I believe that the age limit for enlistment ought to be raised and I am willing to discharge all enlistments under age and even return the boys. But let us see what we did yesterday by the amendment adopted. Here is what the Congress of the United States by this amendment says to the boys of America, "If you will run away from home; if you will turn your back on the advice of your parents and go down to the enlistment office and swear to that which is not true, we will give you a trip to California, pay you while you are going, and turn you loose when you get there; give you a ride for nothing; your feed for nothing; give you a uniform and an honorable discharge and pay your way back home at the rate of 5 cents per mile; and if you can establish that you took cold while there, we will put you on the pension list. All we ask is that you run away from home and swear a lie." And when that boy gets back home and is circulating around among the other boys he will say, "Gee whiz, fellows, it was a dandy trip. I have got an honorable discharge as a real soldier. California is the finest country I ever saw. It does not cost you anything, and they have the best eats you ever had. All you have got to do when you get over there is to tell them you are less than 18 years old. They will not prosecute you. They will not do anything to you. They will ride you for nothing, feed you all you want to eat, and actually pay you for the time on the train. You do not even have to come back when they turn you loose. They hand you 5 cents per mile in cash for every mile it is back home."

That is exactly what is possible and what will happen. We have got to back up. I am just as deeply in sympathy with the folks whose boys run away as anybody, but I want to tell you another thing: Somebody's daddy has got to pay for bringing these boys back. The boys who stay at home and their daddies have got to pay for that. The Secretary of War is not going to take it out of his own pocket. I am willing to pay their way in order to bring them back, but that is fair enough. I am willing to go a long, long way to get these boys home,

but I am not going to put this premium on their running away and offer this temptation for them to swear a lie.

Mr. BLANTON. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not blame my colleague for making that kind of a speech, because he has not any boys of his own. He is unfortunate in that. If he was a father, he could not make that kind of a speech.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That may be true; but if I was a father I would not want the Congress of the United States to say to my boy, "If you will run away from home and swear falsely we will pay you for it and give you a trip to the Pacific coast; pay you 5 cents a mile covering the distance back, put a discharge in your pocket which says you have been a soldier and have been honorably discharged." [Applause.] No, sir! I want the Congress of the United States to be fair and square to these boys, but I want the Congress of the United States to say to the boys of this country that they should stand four-square to what is straight; and when a boy gets about 18 years old and does not know it is wrong to swear a lie, it is about time he is being "rolled" a little bit. It is not a kindness to the boy to reward him for it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Does not the gentleman know that in every State of the Union there are laws that relieve minors from obligations under their contract?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes; I know that; but there is no law which rewards him for its breach.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. And does not the gentleman know another thing: That it is safe to say in 99 cases out of 100 the enlistment of these boys under age is by the connivance of the recruiting officer, and that he is largely to blame?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I am willing to put that age limit up, but I am not willing to offer to the American youth of this country a premium for running away from home and swearing a lie. That is what I say. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. CRAGO. Does the gentleman know of any State in this Union which would relieve a boy of 16, 17, or 18 years of age from responsibility of prosecution for swearing to a lie in court?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No. But nobody wants these boys prosecuted. That much is yielded to their youth and indiscretion. What I am objecting to is that this amendment rewards the violation of their oaths. I will tell you this, that I prosecuted for four years, and I would not ever send a boy to the penitentiary for his first offense. I never did it in the world. Something ought to be done, but in trying to do what we ought to do we have gone to the other extreme. That is what I am saying here. We ought to relieve the present situation. I am not exactly clear how we ought to do it, but I know we have gone too far. The only thing you have left undone to induce these boys to run away from home and commit perjury is to offer them distinguished service medals, which would be in line with this amendment.

Mr. BOX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No. I regret I can not; I have not time. The discharge that boy gets ought to be just this: It ought not to be a blue discharge or a red discharge, but it should be a discharge that gives no ex-service status. I mean the boy who enlists under age and who is discharged because of being under age, and he ought not to get any pay while being hauled around at the Government expense. We ought to turn him loose and get him home, but there ought to be a lesson taught him of the right sort. If he does not learn it, then he may learn it later and pay a higher price for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more so that I may yield to a question.

Mr. ANTHONY. The time is fixed.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The debate on this paragraph is limited to five minutes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The debate on the paragraph and pending amendment was limited to five minutes.

Mr. ANTHONY. To all amendments.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

The CHAIRMAN. On the paragraph.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. And pending amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INCIDENTAL EXPENSES.

Postage; cost of telegrams on official business received and sent by officers of the Army, including members of the Officers' Reserve Corps, when ordered to active duty; for expenses of express to and from frontier posts and armies in the field; hire of laborers in the Quartermaster Corps, including the care of officers' mounts when the same are furnished by the Government, and the hire of interpreters, spies, or guides for the Army; compensation of clerks and other employees of the Quartermaster Corps, and clerks, foremen, watchmen, and organist for the United States disciplinary barracks, and incidental expenses of recruiting; for the apprehension, securing, and delivering of deserters, including escaped military prisoners, and the expenses incident to their pursuit, and no greater sum than \$50 for each deserter or escaped military prisoner shall, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be paid to any civil officer or citizen for such services and expenses; for a donation of \$10 to each dishonorably discharged prisoner upon his release from confinement under court-martial sentence involving dishonorable discharge; and such additional expenditures as are necessary and authorized by law in the movements and operation of the Army and at military posts, and not expressly assigned to any other department, \$6,946,087: *Provided*, That the amounts to be expended from this appropriation for the objects hereinbefore set forth shall not exceed the following respective sums: Donations to discharged military prisoners, \$20,000; hire of labor, \$3,000,000; hire of interpreters, spies, and guides, \$10,000; pay of clerks and other employees, \$8,500,000; pay of clerks, foremen, and organist at disciplinary barracks, \$29,165; recruiting expenses, excluding lodgings, \$100,000; rewards for apprehension and delivery of deserters and escaped military prisoners, \$25,000; telegrams, cablegrams, and postage, \$75,000; clerks for service schools, \$36,922; experimental and development work, \$25,000; and miscellaneous expenses, \$125,000.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, quite a good deal has already been said with regard to the form of the discharge of young men who enlist by misrepresenting their ages—

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I feel that I shall have to take the position that all debate shall be confined to the paragraphs of the bill, because we are making no progress. I hate to take the gentleman off his feet, and will not at this time, but from this time on the committee will have to enforce the rule of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; I do not.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I think the Members will agree that I do not take up very much of the time of the House in talking. But this question has been discussed by a number of Members, and I am unable to agree with the views expressed by some of my colleagues, for whom I have a high personal regard, and I am astonished at the position taken by some of them. They speak as if a boy is court-martialed or very greatly mistreated simply because in his eagerness to get into the Army he misrepresents his age. The fact of the business is that under the present practice the boy is not punished in any way whatever for that offense.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. HUSTED. Is it not the contention of the War Department that the boy who enlists under age is subject to court-martial for obtaining pay through fraudulent misrepresentation of his age?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. HUSTED. That is the contention of the War Department, and if he is not court-martialed it is simply because they do not enforce what they contend they have the right to carry out.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. They never undertake to carry that out, and never have carried it out. The fact of the business is that the boys are not in any manner punished because of their fraudulent statement as to their age in their effort to get into the Army service. I am not prepared to say that the boy is subject to much criticism if he misrepresents his age because of a patriotic impulse to serve his country.

However, it not infrequently happens that a boy, merely through a spirit of adventure or recklessness, gets into the service by misrepresenting his age, and after seeing some of the country at Government expense and growing tired of the service he wants to get out. He then takes advantage of his own wrongful act by seeking and obtaining a discharge on the ground that he misrepresented his age and was under 18 at the time of enlistment. He is in the unenviable attitude of saying, "I want you to discharge me because I told a lie about my age." However, even under those circumstances a discharge is granted, and properly so, on the ground that technically and legally the boy was never in the Army. However, even when he takes advantage of his own wrongful act and procures a

discharge on those grounds, he is not court-martialed or otherwise punished in any manner. I do not take the position that he should be punished. However, I do take the position that he should not be rewarded by being given the same character of discharge as he would have received if he had served his term, or had obtained a discharge prior to the expiration of his enlistment upon just grounds and not upon the ground of his own misconduct. Why should he be granted an honorable discharge when his conduct has not been honorable? To render honorable discharges under such circumstances would cheapen all honorable discharges. It would be unfair to those men who had won honorable discharges by faithful, patriotic, and valiant service. Under the present Army regulations and practice a boy obtaining a discharge on the grounds stated is given neither an honorable discharge nor a dishonorable discharge—he is simply given a straight discharge, and this is as it should be.

He is given a discharge which states the plain, unvarnished fact, no more and no less, and that is, that he is discharged because he misrepresented his age and was under 18 years of age when he enlisted—

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Then does not the gentleman think that the law should require a recruiting officer to require the furnishing either of a birth certificate or the affidavit of one of his parents or legal guardian that the boy is 18 years of age if there is any doubt?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I think that some such provision would be proper. I am not defending any recruiting officer who takes a boy in without proper investigation. However, I have aided in procuring discharges for a number of boys who had enlisted under 18 years of age, and not in a single instance has the boy himself or his father represented that the boy was deceived, but has stated that the boy simply misstated his age. I think that is generally true. But I want to ask if it is proper to give a boy who takes advantage of his own wrong, and gets out of the service, the same kind of discharge as is given to the young man who enters the Army at a proper age, or who enlists under 18, but manfully stands to his gun, and completes his term of enlistment?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. ANTHONY. I shall have to object as we are making no progress on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read the paragraph entitled "Transportation of the Army and its Supplies," beginning on line 10 of page 29 and concluding on line 14 of page 34, carrying a total of \$33,800,000.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. McKENZIE. I first desire to ask the chairman of the committee what amount was estimated by the War Department?

Mr. ANTHONY. Sixty-three million dollars was asked for by the War Department for the next fiscal year.

Mr. McKENZIE. And you have appropriated in this bill \$33,800,000? Is that correct?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does the gentleman from Kansas believe that that is a sufficient amount to take care of all the necessary transportation of the Army for the fiscal year 1922?

Mr. ANTHONY. We thought so. Of course the gentleman knows that it was the plan of this whole bill to greatly reduce the size of the Army, and greatly reduce the activities of the whole Military Establishment. We have had evidence to show us that large amounts of money have been wasted by unnecessary transportation of troops. One of the most flagrant cases was that of the recent transportation of a division from Camp Funston, Kans., to Camp Meade, Md., the total cost of which was \$800,000, and no military purpose was subserved thereby.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is the further purpose of the committee in cutting this appropriation to require the Army to concentrate its troops in larger bodies, and keep them there for a long period of time, which has been the practice heretofore?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think we had that in mind, but evidence came to us that the Army was being unnecessarily shifted about. There were constant transfers of men and materials. We have limited expressly the amount that can be used under the various subheads, and it will be simply incumbent on the War Department to adapt themselves to what they already have.

Mr. McKENZIE. One other question. As I understand it this item covers the transport service in the Army?

Mr. ANTHONY. It does.

Mr. McKENZIE. Can the gentleman tell the committee how many concrete transport ships are now used by the War Department or are in process of construction?

Mr. ANTHONY. Does the gentleman mean ships made of concrete?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not know that any are. Evidence was given us to show that about 17 vessels are now in Government service in the transport department, besides a number of small craft, such as tugs, and I think that during the next fiscal year they contemplate operating about 13 ships; but under the appropriation it is barely possible that they will not be able to operate that number.

Mr. McKENZIE. It has been suggested to me by a man who assumed to know, though it was news to me, that the War Department was having constructed a certain number of concrete transport ships. I was surprised to hear it.

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not think there is any ground for such belief.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw his reservation of the point of order?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph on page 22, line 21, down to page 34, line 5.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes the point of order. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. EDMONDS. I make the point of order against the paragraph on the ground that it is new legislation not authorized by law.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman to reserve his point of order.

Mr. EDMONDS. I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman please state why he believes the language should go out? I want to say to him that we were advised by the War Department that they do not contemplate using any transports at the present time for the purpose of transporting civilian passengers or freight; but we felt that in time of emergency they ought to have the right to relieve the demand for such transportation.

Mr. EDMONDS. The gentleman knows that there is no possibility of such emergency now. In the second place, this authorization allowing the transports to carry freight and civilian passengers will militate against the establishment of any lines by our own steamers into the different ports to which the transports run in the trans-Atlantic business. This is limited to trans-Atlantic business. The gentleman can very easily realize that to a ship running on a regular line the difference between carrying 15 or 20 passengers and not carrying them might mean the difference between a profit and a loss in operating that ship. If it is our intention to operate merchant ships, it is evidently foolish for us to attempt to put our own vessels in competition with them.

I should like to call the attention of the gentleman to another thing. We had a line running from Philadelphia to Houston, Tex. There were four Shipping Board ships in that line. We had to withdraw them because the Panama Steamship Line was carrying freight from Tampa, Fla., to Philadelphia at \$4 a ton, when the Shipping Board rate was \$6 a ton. Therefore the four Shipping Board ships are to-day tied up, and we have no use whatever for them.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDS. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. In a case of the kind he states, does he not believe that the Panama Steamship Line should be allowed to operate to full capacity?

Mr. EDMONDS. I am not excusing the Shipping Board for failing to take the freight at \$4, because I tried to get them to do it, and they would not; but nevertheless it is a fact that the competition of the Panama Steamship Line, which is a Government line, has driven four of the merchant ships of the Shipping Board out of business.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make his point of order?

Mr. EDMONDS. I make the point of order.

Mr. ANTHONY. The language is the same as that in the law for the current year.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I make the point of order on the paragraph or I will reserve it. I should like to ask one question in reference to this sale proposition.

On page 33, the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to sell as soon as possible after the approval of this act, on such terms and under such conditions as he may deem most advantageous to the best interests of the Government, not less than 10,000 of the motor trucks and not less than 1,000 of the automobiles owned by the War Department. Does the gentleman understand that under that provision the Secretary of War could not sell any of them unless he sold at once 10,000 motor trucks and 1,000 automobiles at one time?

Mr. ANTHONY. The committee did not think he would have to sell them all at one and the same transaction.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It says that he shall sell not less than 10,000 trucks and not less than 1,000 automobiles.

Mr. ANTHONY. We want him to get rid of that many.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. This forbids him to sell less than 10,000 trucks at one time and less than 1,000 automobiles at one time.

Mr. DEMPSEY. If the gentleman will yield, does it specify the time when he shall sell them? Is not the time entirely open, and when you do not cover it otherwise, does not the time run for the period for which the bill provides? So, would it not give him until the 30th of June, 1922, in which to sell that number of motor trucks?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It says he shall not sell less than 10,000. That is what it says.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Of course, but it does not mean all at one time.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If the gentleman means to direct the Secretary of War to sell 10,000, the way to do so is easy, by striking out "not less than" and making it read that he is authorized and directed to sell 10,000.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I do not think that is the meaning; the meaning is this: That he shall sell in the period covered by the bill, not at any one time but in the period of 18 months, at least 10,000 trucks.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If you direct him to sell 10,000, he would be required to sell 10,000 during the period covered by this law.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is not what you want to accomplish. What you want to accomplish is to be sure that he will not sell less than 11,000 trucks and automobiles, and more if advantageous to the Government.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I was trying to find out what this was for; I did not know but that it was to prevent him from selling any.

Mr. ANTHONY. We are trying to force them to get rid of at least 10,000.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The way the language reads now, if he sold 5 at one time, 10 at another, and so on, and they all figured up at less than 10,000, he would not be complying with the law.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Oh, he could sell the whole 10,000.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. By buying the balance himself?

Mr. DEMPSEY. In the markets.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. We do not speculate on the markets in the law.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas concede the point of order made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EDMONDS]?

Mr. ANTHONY. I concede that the language against which the gentleman makes the point of order is the same as in the current appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. That does not help the Chair very much. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, on page 33, line 14, by striking out the words "not less than," and also the same amendment in line 15.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANN of Illinois: Page 33, line 14, strike out the words "not less than," and in line 15 strike out the words "not less than."

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That directs the Secretary of War to sell this number of trucks and automobiles.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee to some abuses practiced under this

item. When the armistice was signed it appears that every officer in the United States Army on this side of the sea who had no opportunity to go across during the war became suddenly and continually anxious to go to France. There were 3,271 of these officers that were sent to France after the 11th of November and before the 20th day of May, 1920, at the Government expense. Many of these went on purely junketing trips. The only excuse offered for their going was that they might observe, and they were sent over under the guise of observation officers. They toured France and came back and permitted another bunch to go, until, as I say, there were 3,271 of these gentlemen who went over at the expense of this country to visit the battle fields of France.

That is not all. It came to my attention that many officers were taking automobiles at the Government expense. I called the attention of the Secretary of War to the fact, and he denied that such was the case. In reply I informed him two officers had done that thing, to my own knowledge, and were boasting of the fact that they toured France in their own automobiles, shipped over there at the Government expense. I gave him the names. He then had the Inspector General make an investigation, and I have the report of the Inspector General, in which he discloses the fact that he has discovered that there were 37 automobiles sent over for the accommodation of various kinds of officers. Some of them were not officers at all, and some of them were sent over to accommodate the boys who went over to attend the Olympic games.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Was that since the armistice was signed?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That was since the armistice was signed. The justification is that they were authorized to take the automobiles as a part of their baggage. I made an investigation as to whether or not the baggage laws had been abused. I find that when officers of the Army are transferred from one point to another for permanent service, a general is entitled to 20,000 pounds; a lieutenant general, to 15,000 pounds; a major general, to 10,500 pounds; a brigadier general, to 8,500 pounds; a major, to 7,200 pounds; a captain, to 6,000 pounds; first lieutenant, 5,100 pounds; and a second lieutenant, to 4,500 pounds. There is another regulation which provides that where they get a temporary assignment not to be gone any considerable length of time and their status is not to become permanent, that a general can only take 2,000 pounds; a lieutenant general, 1,500 pounds; a major general, 800 pounds; a brigadier general, 700 pounds; a colonel, 400 pounds; a captain, 200 pounds; a first lieutenant, 150 pounds.

The Adjutant General of the United States, one of these officers that went over after the armistice was signed—and I am not contending but what he was justified in going—in calling The Adjutant General's attention to the practice before the committee he informed me that nobody would be authorized to go as he went, under the permanent provision, and that no man could take exceeding 400 pounds, which is the amount allowed a colonel under the temporary assignments.

So that under the admission of the Inspector General of the Army, at least 37 automobiles, owned by private individuals, were sent over at the expense of the Government in order that these gentlemen might tour France, notwithstanding the fact that we had thousands and tens of thousands of automobiles of our own over there that were either being smashed up to avoid reshipment or else rotting away in their store places. This is but one sample of the abuse of the transportation item. Without regard to the matter of expense, they are shipping from one end of this country to the other not only officers but companies of men, sending them abroad, even, without any regard to expense, where it was apparently useless.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. HUSTED. Has the gentleman any information to the effect that we had automobiles in France available for the use of these officers which were in a condition to run?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes. The hearings have disclosed that there were thousands and thousands of them, some of them in perfectly good state of repair, some partially so, and many of them not used at all. The fact is that we sent 20,000 over there after the armistice was signed—brand-new machines.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. But only for official use.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. What is the gentleman's remedy for this thing?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. There ought to be some remedy, either by putting a limitation on this item or else cutting down the item for transportation so that they can not expend it so lavishly.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman is on the committee and he has not done either.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I am not on this subcommittee.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] is here, and he has neither cut down the amount nor put on a limitation.

Mr. ANTHONY. Oh, the gentleman is in error. This bill is literally full of limitations.

Mr. GARNER. Do I understand there is a limitation in respect to this?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; but if we had a Secretary of War who could put his finger on the truth it would be stopped.

Mr. GARNER. But the Secretary of War did not know anything about it, while the General Staff did.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The Secretary of War has found out about it, and it has not entirely ceased yet.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. For the item of water transportation a total of \$20,000,000 plus was asked, and the committee recommended \$12,500,000.

Mr. GARNER. And that is twice as much as it ought to be.

Mr. CRAMTON. But it is some cut.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana says that a number of officers went abroad to France following the armistice. I suppose, and it seems quite clear, that these officers went there to study the war and to get the benefit of the observation that comes from that study, immediately following the cessation of hostilities. How better could anyone be educated? How better could a man supplement his education than by such a trip as that? What better could this country do for him? How better could the high command in the Army have served its useful purpose than in sending men there to learn from the greatest war the world has ever seen its lessons, for future application?

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Instead of criticizing, we ought to commend. This is one of the most useful things the War Department has ever done. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HUSTED. Does not the gentleman think that kind of experience is much more practical than playing the war game down here in the War College?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Infinitely so. Then the gentleman supplements the fact that they had been sent on this most useful, most instructive of trips, by a criticism that some few of them, some limited number, took automobiles, their own automobiles, not Government automobiles, their own private automobiles, in order to lessen the expense of the Government in transporting them.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Is the gentleman justifying the expenditure incident to shipping an automobile to France—

Mr. DEMPSEY. I certainly am justifying it, and it was not an expenditure.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It was not an expenditure?

Mr. DEMPSEY. It lessened the expenses of the trip very materially. Instead of having to be transported at Government expense, when they reached there they took their own automobiles and were transported at their own expense and so lessened, and lessened materially, the expense of the Government.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I wish to correct the gentleman. He misunderstood me. I say that the automobiles were sent there at Government expense.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Oh, yes; the gentleman says they were sent on the ships, which probably did not have anything else to carry in the hold, at Government expense, that they were transported across the Atlantic, a trip of six days; but the gentleman did not say that when they reached the other side and went across the country for a month or two months, they took their own gasoline and their own machines and lessened the expense of the Government. That is what the gentleman did not say, and it is fair that this should be stated.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from New York yield to a question?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I have not yielded to the gentleman from Texas, and when I do I shall advise him of it.

Mr. BLANTON. Why, I just asked the gentleman from New York if he would yield.

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; I regret that I can not. It is just such unfounded criticism as this, just the fact that we criticize when we ought to commend, just the fact that we are criticizing officers of the Army throughout this bill, when we ought to commend them, when they deserve so well of us because of their conduct throughout this World War, that tends to lessen the high reputation the Army holds and to which it is entitled. We

owe the Army a great debt of gratitude. We are here, having won the World War; we did not lose it, and coming in at the eleventh hour we won it, for without us it would not have been won, and without our gallant and able officers our men would not have been led. I say it ill becomes us in this hour of victory, in this hour of pride, in this hour when the name America stands higher than it has ever stood before, to criticize over trifles, over pennies, over small things.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I make my request 20 minutes.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that debate close in 20 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I object. I want to offer an amendment myself.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate be limited to 20 minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I only want to say I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] has made a very admirable and I think convincing statement of the reasons why the Regular Army officers were sent to France after the armistice was signed. It will be recalled that less than half of the commissioned officers of the Regular Army went over to France during the hostilities, and everybody who knows anybody in the larger fraction of the Army who did not go over knows that it broke his heart not to go. If there ever was a sacrifice to a sensitive spirit, it was made by the man whose profession was that of arms to see the world's Great War raging about him and who had to stand back at home and do a schoolmaster's drudgery of preparing other men to go to it. Many a gallant officer in this Army ate his heart out in patience, in silence, but in a sensitiveness of humiliation and regret that his lifetime professional opportunity was to go unimproved.

Therefore, with transports running regularly to Europe after the armistice, great empty steamships going across the water taking very little or no cargo over, it would seem as if it were simply a matter of a practical instructional opportunity to take these officers, one by one as they could be relieved from their duty over here, and give them an opportunity to see the actual terrain where all this four years of fighting took place, to be taken over it by the men still there who planned and fought those battles, and have the various movements of the troops in those several terrains explained to them and come into contact with the very atmosphere itself. It was not merely a sentimental journey; it was not a Cook's tour proposition by any means, because every one of those commissioned officers who made a tour of the battle fields of France under those auspices will be required to learn and understand the military science and tactics and the strategy that was employed upon those fields, and those who did not have the opportunity to go to the fields themselves and actually visualize the situation in their own proper persons will have to try to get it all the rest of their lives from the reading of blue prints, because those very same battles and battle fields are now to be the lessons for instruction and study in all the Army's university system from the basic schools to the General Staff College. It seems like a perfectly proper proposition. It seems to me there ought not to be the slightest bit of debate on that. Even if some one did violate some technical baggage allowance, it would not have been so very bad.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if in the appropriation for transportation of the Army he thinks a sum of money is allowed that will permit the marching of troops with regular field equipment from post to post when transfers of troops and exchanges of posts are to be made?

Mr. ANTHONY. It developed during the hearings that the practice of marching troops has really been discontinued, but the committee felt great economies and great benefits to the troops could be worked out when changing posts, when not too far apart, if they could do it by marching.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I am glad to hear the chairman say that, as I had that in mind. It seems to me there is an opportunity for practical demonstration and training, and bringing troops up to the point of efficiency in an emergency, and I do not think it should only be confined to short distances. I do not see why we could not with great advantage to the officers

and men even make transfer of troops from post to post from one side of the country to the other. Not only that, but there is another side to it. There is not only the practical advantage to the troops themselves in actually learning to take care of themselves outdoors under all kinds of conditions, but it is a great object lesson for the people of this country to see the troops they are taxed to support and see what those troops are doing, and to see that soldiering in the Army, after all, is not what some people seem to think it is, a great holiday junket. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to page 32, line 16.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 32, line 16, after the word "the" strike out the words "purchase and."

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I will.

Mr. ANTHONY. There is nothing provided in the bill for the purchase of ships, and the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Very well.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee whether or not there is any law limiting the right of the War Department to transport troops from one camp to another, or from one station to another. Is there any limitation of authority?

Mr. ANTHONY. There is no limitation. The department is supposed to exercise discretion and economy in these expenditures.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I know a boy who enlisted in the Army last year and was sent to Siberia. In a few months he was sent to the Philippines, and a few months after sent to Hawaii. It seems to me that this is causing unnecessary expense and should not be permitted and should be limited in some way. The taxpayer should not be burdened by unnecessary movement of troops in time of peace, the expense of which is unwarranted—reaches into millions of dollars.

Now, I want to call the attention of the members of the committee to the fact that in the hearings before this committee, page 664, it was developed that in the movement of troops from Camp Funston, Kans., to Camp Meade and to Camp Pike, by an order dated December 1, 1920, there was paid out for sending 190 troops to Camp Pike \$3,591 for passenger fare and \$7,582 for freight; that in sending 2,652 troops from Camp Funston to Camp Meade there was expended for passenger fare \$150,000 and for freight \$446,000, making a total of \$607,173. Now, that does not include the cost of fixing up the camps at Camp Pike and Camp Meade, nor the loss to the Government through the abandonment of Camp Funston. It has been estimated it cost a total of \$800,000 because of the transfer of these troops this winter—for no good purpose whatever.

These same troops had but a few months before been sent to Camp Funston, at which time both Camp Pike and Camp Meade were as available as they are now. Why does our War Department order troops from camp to camp, without regard to either expense or waste? Has there been "axes to grind" or punishment to be inflicted, or is it wholly caprice, with no care or thought of cost?

It seems to me this is an expense that the people ought not to be called upon to pay and that it is absolutely unwarranted. Is there no provision of the law that will in any way prevent the Secretary of War from sending troops from one camp to another without good purpose or reason? It should not be permitted, if it can not be restricted or held within proper bounds, without some approval or authority of Congress.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think it would be almost impossible to limit the expenditure of that kind. You might put a proviso in, however, that men of average intelligence shall expend the funds. [Laughter.]

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. The American people have already made that provision, to take effect on the 4th of March. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 16, after the words "War Department," insert the following:

"Provided, That the Secretary of War shall not dispose of or remove from any camp or cantonment any of its buildings, permanent fixtures, or improvements until May 1, 1921."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, may I offer a few words on this amendment? And I am earnest in the hope that the chairman will not feel it necessary to insist upon the point of order.

I want to read a short telegram that I have received with reference to the department disposing of some of the materials and fixtures at Camp Dodge. This is signed by the president and secretary of the chamber of commerce, and it is in keeping with the conduct of the War Department in the disposal of these permanent camps:

Chamber of commerce feels that in the sale of materials at Camp Dodge insufficient publicity and advertising are being done.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, this is very important, and I think there ought to be a quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa will suspend. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] makes the point of no quorum.

Mr. DOWELL. The gentleman is doing me no favor in making the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman withdraw his point of order?

Mr. DOWELL. I ask him to do it until I dispose of this matter.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I will withdraw it.

Mr. DOWELL. The telegram further says:

Cots sold at 20 cents, costing \$4 each. Twelve hundred furnaces bought one day from Camp Dodge sold by purchaser next day at a profit of \$10 each. Proper newspaper advertising and ordinary good business sense should be used in the sale of this material to realize proper amount for Government. Will you not present matter to War Department for consideration?

Now, gentlemen, according to the statement of the chairman of this committee, we have 14,000 officers in this department. This material is being disposed of by a lieutenant—the highest official in this camp. He is disposing of it, as shown by the telegram just read, without the proper advertising.

I have a letter here which states that it seems to be difficult for the business men who might be interested in some of the things to be sold to ascertain what is to be sold and how they may have an opportunity to bid upon it. It seems to me that this is an outrage and ought to be investigated by the Congress and stopped immediately, if possible. I am hoping that in the interest of proper business methods in this department the chairman of the committee will withhold his point of order against this amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. The main point of the gentleman's suggestion is that no officer higher than a lieutenant has been in charge of these sales?

Mr. DOWELL. That is not the only one. I am saying that no business sense is being used in the disposal of the property.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask the gentleman if that fact is not true in everyday life, and also that some of the gentleman's lieutenants on his side are men of greater judgment than those higher up?

Mr. DOWELL. That is immaterial. I am hoping that this amendment may prevail and for a short time stop the department from disposing of these materials in this unbusinesslike manner.

The Committee on Military Affairs has recommended a resolution that is directly in line with this amendment. A subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs has been appointed to thoroughly investigate and take a survey of all of these camps, and, in view of the conduct of the department in the disposal of property at Camp Dodge, it does seem to me that until this committee has made its investigations the War Department should be stopped from continuing the unbusinesslike methods adopted in its disposal of the property at the present time. And, anyway, it should be stopped from giving this property away.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. MADDEN having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following House concurrent resolution No. 73:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign a duplicate copy of the enrolled bill (H. R. 12469) entitled "An act to authorize the award of a medal of honor to Chief Gunner Robert Edward Cox, United States Navy," and that the Clerk of the House be directed to transmit the same to the President of the United States in compliance with his request.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to bills of the following titles disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SPENCER, Mr. KEYES, and Mr. BECKHAM as the conferees on the part of the Senate:

H. R. 11572. An act for the relief of the John E. Moore Co.; and

H. R. 12634. An act for the relief of Wilhelm Alexanderson.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

HORSES FOR CAVALRY, ARTILLERY, ENGINEERS, ETC.

For the purchase of horses of ages, sex, and size as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War for remounts for officers entitled to public mounts for the Cavalry, Artillery, Signal Corps, and Engineers, the United States Military Academy, service schools, and staff colleges, and for the Indian Scouts, and for such Infantry and members of the Medical Department in field campaigns as may be required to be mounted, and the expenses incident thereto (including \$50,000 for purchase of remounts and \$100,000 for encouragement of the breeding of riding horses suitable for the Army, including cooperation with the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture, and for the purchase of animals for breeding purposes and their maintenance), \$150,100: *Provided*, That the number of horses purchased under this appropriation, added to the number now on hand, shall be limited to the actual needs of the mounted service, including reasonable provisions for remounts, and unless otherwise ordered by the Secretary of War no part of this appropriation shall be paid out for horses not purchased by contract after competition duly invited by the Quartermaster Corps and an inspection under the direction and authority of the Secretary of War. When practicable, horses shall be purchased in open market at all military posts or stations, when needed, within a maximum price to be fixed by the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of any horse below the standard set by Army Regulations for Cavalry and Artillery horses, except when purchased as remounts or for instruction of cadets at the United States Military Academy: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for polo ponies except for West Point Military Academy, and such ponies shall not be used at any other place: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, accept donations of animals for breeding and donations of money or other property to be used as prizes or awards at agricultural fairs, horse shows, and similar exhibitions, in order to encourage the breeding of riding horses suitable for Army purposes: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of War shall report annually to Congress, at the commencement of each session, a statement of all expenditures under this appropriation, and full particulars of means adopted and carried into effect for the encouragement of the breeding of riding horses suitable for the military service.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE and Mr. BARKLEY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JONES of Texas. On page 37, beginning in line 18, I make a point of order on the language:

Except for West Point Military Academy, and such ponies shall not be used at any other place.

I make the point of order it is legislation on an appropriation bill and not authorized by law.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. What is the point of order?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I make the point of order on this language beginning on line 18:

Except for West Point Military Academy, and such ponies shall not be used at any other place.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The language "except for West Point Military Academy" is not subject to a point of order. It is connected with "that such ponies shall not be used at any other place." All the rest of the paragraph is the limitation.

Mr. JONES of Texas. The exception is not a limitation.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The exception is a part of the limitation.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would leave the proviso this way, "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for polo ponies," and strike out the rest.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. "Except for the West Point Military Academy" is a part of the limitation. The gentleman can not make a point of order against that. That is a limitation, and a limitation is not subject to a point of order. The provision that "such ponies shall not be used at any other place" is subject to a point of order.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I do not want to make a point of order on that.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I thought not. The rest is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARKLEY: Page 36, line 21, strike out the figures "\$100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$200,000," and in line 23 strike out "\$150,100" and insert in lieu thereof "\$300,100."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment restores the appropriation that was carried in the current Army appropriation bill for breeding horses for Cavalry purposes.

During the recent World War, according to the testimony of the Army officers having to do with that branch of the service, it was found that there was a great scarcity of horses in the United States suitable for Cavalry purposes. In the last Army appropriation bill, in order to cure that situation, or at least to institute a process by which it would be cured, Congress appropriated \$250,000 for the encouragement of breeding riding horses in the United States suitable for Cavalry purposes. That appropriation became available on the 1st of last July. Under that appropriation the War Department has been able to purchase and distribute throughout the United States 107 horses for use in breeding this particular type of Cavalry horse which is desired by the War Department. The testimony of the Army officers having charge of this work is to the effect that unless the appropriation shall be continued for at least another year or two, the amount of \$250,000 appropriated in the last bill, which became available only about six or seven months ago, will be practically wasted.

My amendment simply restores the \$250,000 which was given last year for this fiscal year for the encouragement of the breeding of this type of Cavalry horse in the United States. Under the system of distribution there are now in every State of the Union, with one or two exceptions, anywhere from 2 to 25 of these horses. The War Department testified before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in charge of this bill that they have received requests for 455 of these horses. Since that time they have received enough requests to make the total number of requests more than 500. They have only 107 with which to meet the demands.

Of course, this is a double-barreled proposition. It not only encourages the breeding of horses suitable for cavalry purposes, but it also encourages the breeding of high-grade horses throughout the United States. The War Department reserves the right to purchase at an agreed price every horse or colt that is produced suitable for Cavalry purposes, so that by scattering these horses throughout the United States the War Department has initiated a process by which there shall be an opportunity of reestablishing in this country a particular type of Cavalry horse suitable for the Army; and it seems to me particularly unfortunate that just as this work is about to be consummated, just as Congress, upon the recommendation of the War Department, has appropriated \$250,000 to start the work, just as we are beginning to start it, we reduce the appropriation to \$100,000, which, under the testimony of the War Department officers, Maj. Scott and others, will mean that the amount already appropriated will be practically wasted unless they continue the appropriation as we started it.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE and Mr. PELL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will yield to the gentleman from Colorado first.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Is it not true that the proceeds arising from the service of these horses is returned to the Treasury?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. The farmers throughout the country are charged a fee for the service of these horses. That money is turned into the Treasury, and the expense of conducting the operations is paid out of the Treasury.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. It would be almost self-sustaining, would it not, after we have developed it to the stage anticipated by the War Department?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. If it is developed and made a permanent part of the War Department operations, ultimately it will be self-sustaining. But at first they need this money in order to purchase these horses and distribute them and get the work started.

Now I will yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PELL].

Mr. PELL. The gentleman's amendment would benefit the farmers and practically everybody who has to do with the horse business quite as much as it would benefit the Army or anybody else? It seems to me it would be so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. The work which has just been inaugurated not only benefits the Army in the production of Cavalry horses, but it is of universal benefit to the farmers and stock raisers in the United States by enabling them to have high-bred, thoroughbred, standard-bred horses for the improvement of the live stock of this country, and they get that at a nominal expense, upon the payment of a nominal fee.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Is it not a fact that—

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise, and on that motion I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas moves that the committee rise, and on that motion he asks for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. ANTHONY and Mr. McCLINTIC.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 4, noes 95.

The CHAIRMAN. On this vote the ayes are 4, the noes are 95, which, with the Chair, make 100. A quorum is present. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has two minutes remaining.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I will ask the gentleman from Kentucky a question. As a matter of fact, does not the Government pay back to the custodian all the money that is received for the services of the horse?

Mr. BARKLEY. Practically so. They started originally to allow the custodian to receive the fee as his compensation. On account of the fact that the law prohibits that, they turn the money into the Treasury and pay him back practically the equivalent.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Do they not pay him back exactly the amount received, except requiring it to clear through the Treasury?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think they pay him the exact amount. They pay him, though, for the work that he does in keeping up the horses.

These horses are used not only for breeding purposes but they are also used in the Army. During about eight months of the year these horses are taken back to the remount stations of the Army and are used in lieu of other horses which would be purchased by the War Department if they did not have these particular horses, and during about four months of the year, during the breeding season, they are scattered out over the United States. As I said a while ago, nearly every State in the Union has all the way from 2 to 15 of them. I think Virginia, on account of having a remount station, has more than that, but California had six, Texas four or five, Mississippi a number, and the testimony of the Army officers is that every State in the Union, with one or two exceptions in New England, has a supply of these horses.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Does the Government purchase the colts from these horses?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Government reserves the right to purchase those that it may need for Cavalry purposes or for any other Army purposes. It does not purchase all of them.

Mr. HUDSPETH. At some fixed price, or at a price to be agreed upon?

Mr. BARKLEY. At a price to be agreed upon between the Government and the owner of the colt.

Mr. HUDSPETH. It seems to me they ought to fix a price beforehand.

Mr. BLACK. We have in this bill a specific provision requiring the Secretary of War to sell 20,000 horses. How would they buy these colts for the War Department if they sell 20,000 of the horses that they have on hand?

Mr. BARKLEY. As a matter of fact, there have been no colts purchased yet under this provision, because the appropriation became available only the 1st of July, and this approaching spring is the first breeding season, and naturally, of course, there are no colts yet available.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. In all probability it will be two or three years before there is any practical result visible from this appropriation.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that right after the armistice, when the Army appropriation bill was under consideration, my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] got up here and proposed an amendment to stop the purchase of additional Army officers all over the State of Texas. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not aware of any appropriation for the purchase of Army officers.

Mr. BLANTON. I mean horses for Army officers; but they spent \$2,500,000 in buying new horses for Army officers, when now we are seeking to sell 20,000 head of them.

Mr. BARKLEY. The horses now on hand will be practically useless by the time the young colts provided for under this appropriation arrive at such a state of maturity that they will be available for Cavalry purposes, so there is no conflict between the sale of the horses now on hand and the breeding of horses for future Cavalry uses of the Army.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Can the gentleman tell us what the War Department did with the \$1,500,000 appropriated for the purchase of Army horses last year?

Mr. BARKLEY. I can not tell the gentleman what became of that money. It was either unexpended or it was used in the purchase of Army horses.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I should like to call the attention of the gentleman—

Mr. BARKLEY. I desire to impress on the gentleman from Texas and other Members of the House that this is not merely a provision for the benefit of the Army but it is of great benefit to all the people of the United States, by fostering this industry of the breeding of horses.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Does the gentleman want the Government to go into the horse-raising business?

Mr. BARKLEY. Not as a general rule, but it has gone into nearly every other business, some of them a lot more questionable, perhaps, than the horse business. There are other animals that the Government deals in and pays that are less valuable than horses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, this committee think they have made provision for all the money necessary to encourage the breeding of horses suitable for the Army. In the appropriation of \$150,000 we provide \$100,000 to be used for the care of the 105 horses that are now out over the country, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has described. The other \$50,000 is to be used to fulfill the contracts already made to purchase the colts as a result of the breeding of these horses. We have made no provision for the purchase of new stallions, but we have made provision for the continuation of the work that has been inaugurated and is now in progress.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. What price are you going to give for these colts, and at what age are you going to buy them?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think they are bought at the end of one year. I am not sure of the price, but I think it is about \$150. Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Does not the gentleman think we had better close out now and quit the deal?

Mr. ANTHONY. The contracts have already been made, and the Government will have to go through with them. There are only a few of them.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. Did the committee take into consideration the fact that if you buy colts at \$150 apiece a year old, in addition to the expenses connected with horses, they would have to hold the colts three or four years before they are of any value?

Mr. ANTHONY. Let me say to the gentleman that those contracts have already been made with the farmers.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I feel that such contracts ought to be stopped.

Mr. ANTHONY. We felt that we ought to make the appropriation for such contracts as have been made.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. Does the gentleman think that Army officers have a right to make contracts of this kind for the future, and if he thinks that they do, if he does not think a provision ought to be put in the bill forbidding them?

Mr. ANTHONY. If they have them in, and I think they have, the animals would be so valuable, being a fine type of a horse, that I think we ought to purchase the few that will be available.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following as a substitute:

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 36, line 14, strike out all of the paragraph on page 36, all of page 37, down to and including the word "that" in line 20.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I think that the amendment which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] offered would put the Government in the horse business, which would be absurd. It would put the Army into the horse-raising

business. An item of news appeared the other day to the effect that some Army officer put 30 or 40 horses in a box car and that they smothered for want of air.

Mr. BEE. Does the gentleman know that statement is true?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I do not know whether it is, but it was reported, and I have seen no denial. I do not make the charge. Whether it is true or not, I do not believe that the Army officers know as much about raising horses as the agricultural or mechanical colleges, which are stationed all over the United States, organizations that teach, among other things, the care and raising of stock. Putting the Army into the horse-raising business is absurd. I want to call attention to the way the Army has handled the horse business heretofore.

When the war was over the Army had more than 200,000 horses—nearly 300,000. They sold 162,000 horses, for which they paid \$190 apiece, at an average price of \$90 apiece. And yet in the appropriation bill for that same year they asked for and secured an appropriation for \$2,500,000 to buy new horses.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Is the gentleman moving to strike out the paragraph?

Mr. JONES of Texas. No; I am striking out that part of the provision which puts the Government into the horse business.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The chairman says that there is a contract existing between the Government and the farmers to purchase these colts. What are you going to do with them?

Mr. JONES of Texas. The Government will, of course, carry out any of its existing contracts; but I am opposed to lavish and wasteful appropriations to put the Government to raising horses. Last year's appropriation bill was limited to the fiscal year, and if any such contracts were entered into to run through other years they were entered into without authority. I want to call attention to the further fact that when we appropriated \$2,000,000 a year ago those in charge of the bill said if any of the money was not needed it would not be used and the surplus returned to the Treasury. They said that they had enough horses, and more than enough to run last year if the Army should be kept at 175,000 men, but they wanted an appropriation for a million and a half in view of the fact that there was an authorization for 286,000 men. Gen. Harmon stated that they had enough horses for the past year to care for an Army of 175,000 men. Yet the House appropriated a million and a half dollars last year. I want to know what became of that million and a half dollars. If they spent the money that way, how do you expect the Government to come out on appropriations for putting the Army into the horse business? That is not a business proposition. The Army is a military organization. God knows we appropriate enough money for the purposes for which it was created, and the idea of putting the Government into the horse business is unthinkable.

Mr. BARKLEY. The appropriation does not put the Government into the horse business, and neither does my amendment. The Government is in the horse business, anyway.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes; and I am trying to get the Government out of the horse business. I insist that inasmuch as Gen. Harmon's testimony was to the effect that that year they paid \$190 for horses, which they sold for \$90, that they had enough on hand for an Army of 175,000 men, and when we lay alongside this fact the appropriation we made last year, I think that they have enough money for horses. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, the testimony last year and the year before is that in the Army a horse eats his head off in six months. In fact, this was the sole excuse after the war which the Army officers gave for selling off thousands of horses left over from the war, and then within a few months asking for more money for horses.

How can the Government afford to buy horses for a military organization that can not make a better business success than that?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, in reference to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], I would like to have read a few extracts from a letter I received yesterday. It is from Mr. A. B. Hancock, who is thoroughly familiar with the subject under discussion. In the letter he refers to the action proposed here as parallel to that of the French Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the letter may be read in the time of the gentleman from Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA., February 2, 1921.

HON. R. WALTON MOORE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MOORE: The scarcity of cavalry horses in this country became so manifest during the late war that the last Congress appropriated \$250,000 to encourage horse breeding. These funds were placed in the hands of the Army remount service, with specific instruction governing expenditure.

The officers of that service, charged with the responsibility of expending these funds in such manner as to secure the best possible results, have purchased a little more than 100 stallions of breeds suitable for siring good Army remounts, and in conjunction with experienced horsemen have worked out a plan for putting these stallions in communities where a sufficient number of good mares exist.

The plan is similar to the one followed in France for more than 100 years. It secures a maximum number of good cavalry horses at minimum cost to the Government, at the same time increasing materially the individual breeder's prospect of success by making good sires accessible. Furthermore, it encourages all breeders of saddle horses through widening interest in and use of saddle horses.

The American Remount Association and our own organization backed up the request of the Army remount service for the continuance of the appropriation of \$250,000 per year for the next fiscal year beginning July 1, 1921.

More than 500 applications are already on file with the remount service from communities anxious to secure sires suitable for begetting good cavalry stock. Farmers pay regular service fees for such sires; but for the coming year the full appropriation is most urgently needed or the work just barely started will be seriously crippled.

I fully appreciate the necessity of rigid curtailment of Government expenditures, but there are thousands of items which can be much more advantageously curtailed than this appropriation which has to do with our horse industry and our future national defense, for it must be remembered that horses can not be manufactured overnight. Hence it is important that we carry along in a careful and instructive way such encouragement to horse breeding as will provide us with an ample supply of Cavalry horses and officers' mounts for future use.

It is worth while remembering, too, that our enormous exports of horses and mules during the last 10 years were largely for war purposes and brought very large sums in the United States and the British officers have been frank to concede that if it had not been for the reservoir of Artillery horses existing in America they would have been very hard pressed at critical periods.

Our total exports during the 9-year period ending June 30, 1919, amounted to 1,149,763 and 376,836 mules; 1,526,599 all told.

But it was clearly evident and a matter of comment among all foreign officers purchasing horses in this country that our supply of Cavalry horses was dangerously low and that aggressive steps needed to be taken to conserve the existing supply for future needs.

Sincerely, yours,

A. B. HANCOCK.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the Government's purchasing and keeping the very best stallions in the various neighborhoods throughout the United States that are raising horses should be criticized at this time. I am somewhat amused, however, at the statement that the Government has lately gone into the horse business. There has been a great deal of horseplay on this floor for many years, and there is a good deal of horseplay in reference to this item. As a matter of fact, whatever may be the condition of the Army to-day with reference to horses, in two or three years from now the horses will either be too old or will be dead. The purpose of this appropriation is to encourage the breeding of horses that are capable of carrying an Army officer and of becoming good Cavalry horses, and in order to get the type of horses needed in time of war this is justified as one of the appropriations in the Army appropriation bill. However, I do not think that is the chief asset in this activity on the part of the Government. I think the principal asset is that it tends to improve the character of the horses in every neighborhood engaged in this sort of business.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. And as an indirect benefit to the people as well as a direct benefit to the Army it is worth a great deal. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Does the gentleman think an Army officer is better qualified to judge of a good horse than a ranchman or a stockman who is in the business?

Mr. SISSON. I do not know, but I do not think a ranchman is better qualified to select a Cavalry horse than an Army officer. He may be a better horse trader or horse jockey, but the veterinarians in the Army know more about the strength and the length and the size of horses than the horse jockeys down around the courthouses in Texas. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is not the gentleman willing to admit that under existing conditions Cavalry, as an effective arm of the Army, is rapidly disappearing?

Mr. SISSON. That may be true to some extent. However, I do not believe the prophecy that a great many people made that cavalry would be dispensed with has been making good, according to the experience during the late war. The demands of our allies for horses was a demand which this country could not supply. The whole world was called upon to supply the horses needed in the late war. I do not believe that Congress will act wisely in abandoning this enterprise at this time. We have none of these horses in my community and but three in my State. I wish we had more. I do know that the agricultural college did make an effort to get one of these horses, and I hope it succeeded, and so far as Army officers having anything directly to do with the breeding of these horses is concerned they

have but very little, because the matter is turned over to a custodian, who is assumed to know something about horses and how to breed them. It is infinitely cheaper, in my judgment, to have the horses bred and kept and used in the hands of the people who breed them and let them use them than to take them from the people, let them be idle and be fed by the Government, but we should have them available when war comes so that we can be sure to get the proper supply for war purposes quickly, rather than to spend millions of dollars keeping them on hand as we do now.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Was it not the testimony of Army officers last year, and was not that given as the reason for wanting to sell horses, that it cost the Army the value of the horse to keep it six months?

Mr. SISSON. I think it does cost a great deal to keep a horse.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Was not that their reason for selling?

Mr. SISSON. I do not know what the reason assigned was. I was not a member of the committee last year. I am exercising my own reason now and decline to surrender my own reasoning powers to an Army officer or anyone else.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas rose.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to participate in this discussion, but there seems to be a good deal of misapprehension about the matter. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] wanted to know if the Cavalry service had not gone into disuse. Cavalry service will never go into disuse as long as we have armies. There is no chance for an army to exist without a cavalry; and, so far as I am concerned, I want my Government whenever it buys a cavalry horse to buy one fitted for the service. I want to see the farmers that my colleague talks about sell their horses to the Army, but I want horses selected because of their adaptability for the service. Now, you take the great Rio Grande border, where we are apt to have trouble most any minute. The modern methods of warfare can not be used in that country. You can not pursue those bandits with any great success without a cavalry.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEE. I will.

Mr. HUDSPETH. You would not expect men to chase those bandits in that mountain country with the character of horses they provide now?

Mr. BEE. I am glad the gentleman suggested that.

Mr. HUDSPETH. If you did, you would not chase them very far.

Mr. BEE. No; you would not chase them very far. The gentleman from Kentucky is not in favor of putting the Government in the horse business. Since the beginning of this Government the Government has been in the horse business, so far as the provision of horses for the Cavalry is concerned. Let us encourage the purchase of the right character of horses, so that when the time comes the horses can do the work. Let me make another suggestion to the committee. The day of automobiles and other modern conveyances has lessened to a great extent the encouragement of the breeding of fine horses. Horses are not being raised now like they were 25 or 30 years ago, and unless you do something like this to put encouragement into it you are not going to get the benefit and get the character of horses you want. Now, I am proud of my country. I do not want to see my cavalymen traveling about the country on a lot of little fleabitten crow baits. I want them upon horses fitted for endurance and by breeding for the character of work they are required to do; and if it is putting the Government into the horse business to have a good character of horses for the Cavalry it is just simply continuing what the Government has been doing since its establishment. I sincerely hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of striking out the entire item. I do not believe in case we have another war that the Cavalry is very important. It was demonstrated in the Civil War, and I have had as much experience in fighting Cavalry as any man in the United States, because in the Atlanta campaign of 110 days I belonged to the Twenty-third Army Corps, which was the flanking corps of Sherman's army.

We had a superior army to Johnston's army and he had to piece out his flanks with Cavalry. We had to fight Cavalry, and I undertake to say now that I can back 800 veteran infantrymen with bayonets against any 2,000 cavalymen. A cavalymen on horseback has no business with a man on foot with a bayonet at the muzzle of his musket.

In our Civil War cavalymen were used largely for reconnoitering purposes. Now we are using aeroplanes for reconnoitering purposes, much more effective and less costly in human life. Furthermore, in our war I carried a gun during the first year, a muzzle-loader, that could only kill at 800 yards. Now they have a gun that will shoot twelve times where our gun would shoot but once, and kill at the distance of a mile and a quarter. In our war they could range a squadron of Cavalry at the distance of 800 yards and make a charge at double-quick and be on us before we could load twice. Now that can not happen.

In another respect the Government industry of horse breeding, as every intelligent horseman knows, has been an absolute failure. Army officers are not scientific breeders and never can be. I had the privilege of editing a horse paper for 12 years. I remember when this stud-horse business was started by the Government, and I predicted at the time that it would be a failure, and it has been a costly failure. Why? They do not understand scientific breeding. They brought these stallions here from abroad and they have been breeding them to ranch horses. What is the result? Ranch inferior colts. Why? Because the ranch wild horse has been inbred for a thousand years, and we have not standard-bred horses that have been bred 100 years. Hence, the more intense ranch blood prevails in the offspring. Those stallions from France have been inbred less than a hundred years. The consequence is we have been breeding runt ranch colts, and we have never bred a Cavalry horse that was fit for a cavalymen to ride.

And here you are, with 2,500,000 men out of work and thousands being fed by public charity, as they are in my locality, and yet you are wasting the precious time of Congress and appropriating money in the stud-horse industry getting ready to fight some impossible war in an improbable future. [Laughter and applause.]

I do not think I have any more to say.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 15, yeas 58.

So the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. ANTHONY and Mr. BLANTON demanded a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 20, yeas 48.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment of Mr. JONES of Texas: Page 37, line 18, after the word "ponies," strike out the remaining part of line 18, all of line 19, and line 20, down to and including the word "place."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of Texas) there were—ayes 8, yeas 41.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

BARRACKS AND QUARTERS.

For barracks, quarters, stables, storehouses, magazines, administration and office buildings, sheds, shops, and other buildings necessary for the shelter of troops, public animals, and stores, and for administration purposes, except those pertaining to the Coast Artillery; for construction of reclamation plants; for constructing and repairing public buildings at military posts; for hire of employees; for rental of the authorized allowance of quarters for officers, including members of the Officers' Reserve Corps when ordered to active duty, on duty with the troops at posts and stations where no public quarters are available; of barracks or authorized allowance of quarters for noncommissioned officers and enlisted men, men on duty where public quarters are not available, including enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserve, retired enlisted men, and members of the enlisted Reserve Corps when ordered to active duty; for grounds for cantonments, camp sites, and other military purposes, and for buildings or portions of buildings for occupation by troops, for use as stables, storehouses, and offices, and for

other military purposes; for the hire of recruiting stations and lodgings for recruits; for such furniture for the public rooms of officers' messes and for officers' quarters at military posts as may be approved by the Secretary of War; for wall lockers in permanent barracks and refrigerators in barracks and quarters; for screen doors, window screens, storm doors and sash, and window shades for barracks, offices, and quarters, and for flooring and framing for tents, and for the National Guard when called or drafted into the service of the United States, \$7,500,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for the rent of offices for military attachés.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment:

Page 39, line 3, strike out the words "For the hire of recruiting stations and lodgings for recruits."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLANTON: Page 39, line 3, strike out the language: "For the hire of recruiting stations and lodgings for recruits."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, although the matter is still mixed up somewhat as to what the real policy of the dominant party in this House is to be as to the size of our Army, I take it that it is the sense of the majority of the membership of this House that recruiting is going to stop. We have got an Army now of 237,000 men, and by every indication of legislation that the House has been interested in lately it is indicated that that must be reduced; that the figures must be reduced from 237,000 down to at least 175,000, and, according to the pay in this bill, to 150,000, or at the utmost 160,000, counting the Philippine Scouts.

Now, if that is the case, what is the use of providing money here for the pay of recruiting stations and renting recruiting stations and paying for the lodgings of recruits during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922? It just gives the Secretary of War, if he should be anything like the present one, an opportunity and excuse for going on and recruiting, against the will of Congress, and then when we got after him he could come back and say, "If you did not intend for me to recruit, why did you put language in the bill providing money for hiring recruiting stations and paying for the lodgings of recruits?" I say it is foolishness to put this language in the bill, and it ought to come out. I am glad to see that the gentleman from Wyoming, the majority leader, has come in, because I am sure he will help us to strike it out.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I rise in pro forma opposition to the amendment, to ask the chairman if there has been any suggestion made to the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations about the desirability of garrisoning some of our troops in cities instead of in detached and distant Army posts, as has been followed in all the years past?

Mr. ANTHONY. There has been some discussion of that; but, I will say to the gentleman, the proposition for the construction of barracks and quarters is involved in an estimate that was sent to the committee that is in charge of the sundry civil bill, and was left out of this bill, and that question was not gone into by this committee.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I would be glad to make this suggestion, that may be thought over before we have the matter up seriously. The Army is confronted with the necessity for a great deal of construction for barracks and quarters. When it is determined where the troops are to be located the question will be as to where the barracks and quarters shall be situated and what shall be their character and extent, because it involves a great building program. It has been suggested, in the service and out of it, for a great many years, that we might follow the continental system of garrisoning our troops in cities in such constructed quarters as may be necessary, and thereby save an immense overhead in water, light, and all that sort of thing, that we have to provide for independently now, and also give the troops, in the natural resources of the cities, much of that recreation and social opportunity that we have to manufacture for them now when they are out on distant posts.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 8, noes 28.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will withdraw that request. I have to be consistent, and—

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman only prefers a request to revise his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Ohio has that right already.

Mr. SHERWOOD. I just asked for a revision; not an extension.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, in reference to the amendment which I offered a moment ago I want to say that I have no objection to the game of polo or the use of polo ponies, but I would not vote to make the taxpayers of the country pay to furnish any officers or any employees with polo ponies at the expense of the taxpayers. I have no prejudice against polo or polo ponies, any more than I have an objection to a man playing long-distance marbles with a shinny stick and calling it "golf," but I want to make it clear that I do not believe in the policy of the Government appropriating money for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY POST EXCHANGES.

For continuing the construction, equipment, and maintenance of suitable buildings at military posts and stations for the conduct of the post exchange, school, library, reading, lunch, amusement rooms, and gymnasium, including repairs to buildings erected at private cost, in the operation of the act approved May 31, 1902, for the rental of films, purchase of slides, supplies for and making repairs to moving-picture outfits and for similar and other recreational purposes at training and mobilization camps now established, or which may be hereafter established, and for such other purposes not enumerated above as the Secretary of War may deem advisable, to be expended in the discretion and under the direction of the Secretary of War, \$150,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I do so for the purpose of asking the Chairman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. WALSH. No; I decline to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserved a point of order. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes on his reservation.

Mr. WALSH. What is this moving-picture outfit, "For the rental of films, purchase of slides, supplies for and making repairs to moving-picture outfits, and for similar and other recreational purposes at training and mobilization camps now established or which may be hereafter established"?

Mr. ANTHONY. Part of this appropriation contemplates the maintenance of moving-picture apparatus as a part of the entertainment provided at the large camps for the entertainment of the enlisted men. Only a small part of the appropriation will be used for that purpose. But the old committee for years previous considered it necessary to provide some entertainment and amusement for the men.

Mr. WALSH. In connection with military training?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; for their entertainment. The department asked for \$800,000 as the entire appropriation for the fiscal year. They were given \$500,000 last year. We have cut it to \$150,000, and in doing that we have cut out practically all authority for hiring civilian employees and all the recreation activities which grew up during the war, and which the department wanted to continue. We think we have cut this down to the bone.

Mr. WALSH. These moving-picture exhibitions are not in connection with their military training?

Mr. ANTHONY. In some ways they are. It has been suggested that the men could possibly be instructed in a good many military matters through the use of moving pictures, and the new recruits are given instruction by the use of moving pictures. At one of the military posts, at Fort Sill, which the Committee on Military Affairs visited last year, we got more real information as to modern artillery and shrapnel shells and all that business by a 20 or 30 minute exhibition of moving pictures than I had ever obtained in years of observation. It is very valuable.

Mr. WALSH. Is it better than actual operation?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes. We also saw the actual operations.

Mr. WALSH. That might apply to members of the committee, but I am thinking of the soldiers themselves.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I think what the chairman has in mind was the diagrammatic demonstration on the screen of how the artillery ammunition is made, showing all the processes, how the inside of the shell looks, what acts upon the mechanism to produce the discharge, and so forth. All those things are shown by diagrams and charts in a much more impressive way than could be done by seeing them in the field.

Mr. WALSH. It says "for recreation purposes."

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. If you have your troops garrisoned in a city, they have these natural opportunities for recreation, but if you isolate them out on the plains or on old Indian posts somewhere you have got to make the men contented in order to keep them in the Army.

Mr. WALSH. Well, we are giving them an education in order to do that. We are showing them how to be a blacksmith or a bootblack or an electrician.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts that there we are going out of our jurisdiction. I heartily agree with him.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order. As I understand it, we have enough moving pictures now to take care of an Army of 4,000,000 people. I do not think there is any necessity for authorizing anything of this kind, and therefore I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. ANTHONY. What is the point of order, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. It is unauthorized by any law.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman indicate the language to which his point of order applies?

Mr. MCCLINTIC. The whole section, I believe, is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] the act of May 31, 1902, before him?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly plain that this paragraph is a continuing public work. There are some little incidentals to it that may not be, but the paragraph itself in form provides "for the construction, equipment, and maintenance of suitable buildings at military posts," which has repeatedly been held to be in order as a continuing public work.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, this section provides for the rental of moving-picture films, and provides for free lunches, and I have never heard of any law authorizing an appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I submit to the Chair that post exchanges were authorized by the act of July 16, 1892.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. That has nothing to do with the rental of moving-picture films.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Kansas cite the Chair to the statute?

Mr. ANTHONY. Twenty-seventh Statutes, 178.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will examine the law and will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I should like to call the attention of the Chair to the latter part of the paragraph, which authorizes the Secretary of War to expend certain money for this purpose—

And for such other purposes not enumerated above as the Secretary of War may deem advisable.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it may be that the latter part of the paragraph, which provides for expenditures for such other purposes not enumerated as the Secretary of War may deem advisable, is subject to the point of order, if it should be held that that language did not relate to purposes similar to those described in the paragraph.

In my judgment it is quite within the power of the Congress, where we have an Army, to provide for the maintenance and subsistence of the Army and to make provision necessary to maintain discipline and organization in the Army.

The purpose of these recreational exercises is largely to keep the enlisted men of the Army in the camps instead of sending them into the town near by to obtain recreation not so innocent. If we can maintain better discipline in the Army and better order in the Army by providing pictures for men to look at in the camp rather than to send them to see vice in a neighboring joint, I think it is quite within our power to appropriate for that purpose, as included in the general purpose of maintaining the Army.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman contend that under that clause they could rent a moving-picture theater, or that under that general implied authority they could employ moving-picture actors and actresses to play the part, and that they could rent a studio?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have always found that the wise man confines himself to the point at issue instead of scattering over the world to find something else. It is not for me to construe the law.

Mr. WALSH. I did not expect the gentleman to.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I maintain that it is within the power of Congress to provide for recreational exercises, and that it is quite within the power of Congress to provide for the rental of moving-picture films.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Under the blanket authorization of this bill the Secretary of War could buy an automobile for every man in the Army.

The CHAIRMAN. It is clear to the Chair that the last four lines of the paragraph carry it beyond what is now authorized by law, that language being—

And for such other purposes not enumerated above as the Secretary of War may deem advisable.

It seems to the Chair that while it might be very desirable to leave that language in the bill, at the same time it would not come within any existing law. Therefore as to the language the Chair sustains the point of order. Does the gentleman make the point of order against the whole paragraph on that account?

Mr. MCCLINTIC. I make the point of order against the whole paragraph.

Mr. ANTHONY. Does the Chair sustain the point of order against the entire paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order having been made against the entire paragraph and a portion of the paragraph being subject to a point of order, the Chair sustains the point of order as to the entire paragraph.

Mr. ANTHONY. I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANTHONY: Page 39, after line 13, insert: "MILITARY POST EXCHANGES."

"For continuing the construction, equipment, and maintenance of suitable buildings at military posts and stations for the conduct of the post exchange, school, library, reading, lunch, amusement-rooms, and gymnasium, including repairs to buildings erected at private cost, in the operation of the act approved May 31, 1902, for the rental of films, purchase of slides, supplies for and making repairs to moving-picture outfits and for similar and other recreational purposes at training and mobilization camps now established, or which may be hereafter established, \$150,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this amendment. I believe that the War Department is trying to bring about better moral surroundings and conditions for the soldiers in our Army. In 1916 I had an appointment to speak in El Paso, the home city of my distinguished colleague [Mr. HUDSPETH]. I understood that my appointment was in the courthouse, and by mistake I went to the courthouse building a few minutes before 8 o'clock and found the whole building quartered with United States soldiers. In that building I saw, I think, at least 20 different groups of young men playing poker, craps, and other gambling games. The whole main courthouse floor was full of such groups. They had to pass the time in some way. You can hardly blame a bunch of boys for wanting some kind of amusement and excitement. If at that time they had been furnished wholesome places of amusement, they would have gone to them.

Mr. HUDSPETH. What character of appointment did the gentleman have there at that special time? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. If I had been in the Army with them, I would probably have been in one of those groups, because the American boy is going to have some kind of amusement. You can just put that in your pipe and smoke it, and if it is not the right kind of amusement, it is going to be the wrong kind.

Now, do you know that the Army gets these films for just about one-twentieth of what they cost the picture showmen? They buy some of the best films that the moving-picture people produce, and they get them at a very nominal price, and the soldier boys of our country get the benefit of them. I want to say in behalf of the Army officers of the country that they have been gradually bringing about every kind of moral condition possible to elevate our boys and to throw every moral surrounding around them that is possible; and I do not think that any part of this money is ill spent. I think the money that we

provide for their entertainment and for looking after other things besides training them to fight is money well spent. Of course, they are being trained to fight, but they are not fighting now, and I hope they will not have to fight in my lifetime or in the lifetime of any of my friends here. They must have wholesome pastimes, and they must have proper training in that line, and although I am an economist, I am glad to see them spending some money in this way.

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas. It proposes to increase the amount from \$150,000 to \$250,000. I offer it as an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the figures "\$150,000" and insert "\$250,000."

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the Clerk to read in my time a letter from one of the officers engaged in this work. I will say that I believe in this proposition. I think they are asking for too much money but I have stated it at what I think is a sufficient amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the letter in the gentleman's time.

The Clerk read as follows:

APPROPRIATION "MILITARY POST EXCHANGES."

One of the finest chapters in the history of the World War will be the story of the successful effort to provide for the amusement and recreation of our soldiers overseas and in the training camps at home. Great ingenuity and insight into human nature has been shown to supply our soldiers at home and abroad with recreation, which banishes monotony and tedium and outpulls the allurements of vice.

This work, so well carried on by the welfare societies during the war, has been taken over for the Regular Army in time of peace. This problem of satisfying the social instinct of segregated men without the aid of intoxicants or the allurements of vice, the recreational program of the Army is successfully solving.

All recreational activities are carried on under the provisions of the appropriation act "Military post exchanges." Last year's appropriation was \$500,000 for an Army of 175,000 men. The estimate for the fiscal year 1922 submitted was \$833,000. The amount allowed by the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee in its report is but \$150,000. This amount is entirely inadequate to carry out the recreational program, which includes: Recreational athletics, service clubs, post exchanges, libraries, music, moving pictures, community cooperation, and hostesses.

The small appropriation granted will practically stifle all of these activities and will eliminate hostesses entirely. The activities of the organization of hostesses is considered the most beneficial of all of our recreational activities, in that it brings into the life of our segregated soldiers social contact with the finest type of women. The hostesses in the camps and posts provide entertainment, meet and care for relatives and friends of the soldier, and provide proper surroundings at the hostess house for the soldier to meet family, friends, and relatives. The hostesses are large factors in enlisting the interest of communities in the Army and its welfare. The administration of the other activities can be done by military personnel, but in no way can we carry on the activities in women's relations without the employment of women.

No request is made for a change in the wording of the appropriation item as it stands in the report of the subcommittee, but it is earnestly requested and recommended that a minimum of \$500,000 be provided for recreation under the item of appropriation "Military post exchanges."

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I wish to say that the gentleman from New York and myself are both in favor of extending to the Army posts the opportunity to give the soldier boys this kind of amusement and training. I have visited a good many of the posts, and I do know that during the World War they were furnished with moving-picture machines, football suits, boxing gloves, and practically every kind of an appliance for entertaining them in a proper way. Inasmuch as we had a sufficient amount when we had 4,000,000 men in the Army, it seems to me that there should remain on hand a sufficient amount to take care of a little army of 150,000. It is for that reason that I made the point of order and the suggestions that I made a few moments ago. I do not object to an appropriation for the purpose of giving to our soldiers a proper amount of recreation and entertainment, but we all know that we have provided for their recreation in post buildings and have given them libraries and suitable reading rooms. I think that the amount in the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee is sufficient to take care of the needs of the Army at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

VOCATIONAL TRAINING.

For the employment of the necessary civilian instructors in the most important trades, and for the payment of their traveling expenses, as authorized under existing law; for the purchase of carpenter's, machinist's, mason's, electrician's, and such other tools and equipment as may be required, including machines used in connection with the

trades; for the purchase of materials, live stock (including fowls), and other supplies necessary for instruction and training purposes, and the construction, repair, or alteration of such buildings needed for vocational training in agriculture; for shops, storage, and shelter of machinery as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of section 27 of the act approved June 3, 1916, authorizing, in addition to the military training of soldiers while in the active service, means for securing an opportunity to study and receive instruction upon educational lines of such character as to increase their military efficiency and enable them to return to civil life better equipped for industrial, commercial, and general business occupations, part of this instruction to consist of vocational education either in agriculture or the mechanic arts, \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That whenever possible officers, warrant officers, noncommissioned officers, or other enlisted men shall be detailed as instructors: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for salaries of civilian instructors other than in technical branches: *And provided further*, That not more than \$50,000 shall be expended for salaries and no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$3,000 per annum: *And provided further*, That farm products and the increase in live stock (including fowls) which accrue as incidental to vocational training in agriculture and animal husbandry shall be sold under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, and the proceeds of such sales shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, line 2, strike out the figures "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$3,500,000."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment which I have the right to offer, and which I propose to offer, and which I would like to have read now for information, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak 10 minutes in discussing both amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman desires to have the other amendment read for information?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, line 5, after the word "instructors," strike out lines 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and line 10 to and including the words "per annum."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto end in 25 minutes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Reserving the right to object, may I have one minute?

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I make it 30 minutes, and 5 minutes of which shall be for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I hope I will not lay myself liable to the charge that I have a single-track mind because I discuss the question of vocational education quite frequently. It is a subject that I am deeply interested in, and which I have undertaken to pay some attention to during my service in this House.

This amendment involves the question of carrying out in good faith the pledges and obligations of the Government to a great number of young men who enlisted in the Army on the special promise that they would receive certain benefits and advantages by reason of their joining the service.

As I stated a few days ago, the question of vocational education was not put into the military law of the country at the request of the Army. It first appeared in the national defense act of 1916, and subsequently was incorporated into the Army reorganization act and passed by the controlling party in this Congress. It was a duty not sought by the Army. In fact, as some of the distinguished major generals in reports on this subject have said, they at first derided the purposes of this law and looked upon it as an innovation and a departure from real military service, which did not meet with their approval; but upon trial of the system, upon seeing the actual benefit not only to the efficiency of the men as soldiers, but in making better citizens when they had finished their terms of enlistment, all of the officers of high rank in command of this activity testify that vocational training in the Army has proven a great success.

I say the Government of the United States is not under an implied but an express obligation to every young man who enlists in the service upon the assurance that he will be given the benefit of a course of vocational training, and the Government should see to it that that pledge, as long as the system is in effect in the Army, is carried out in an efficient and business-like way.

If gentlemen had taken occasion to read the testimony of Gen. Haan and other officers charged with carrying out this law, they would have become convinced that it is impossible for this vocational training to be carried on during the next

fiscal year with this pitiful appropriation of \$1,000,000 provided in the present bill. The amount carried in the existing law for the present fiscal year is \$3,500,000, the amount that I have asked in this amendment. They all testify—and the hearings will bear me out, and it can not be successfully contradicted—that they can not possibly get along with any less appropriation and carry on this training, as it was evidently the purpose of Congress that it should be carried on. I very much regret that this appropriation was made by a subcommittee of gentlemen who I fear are not in sympathy with the purposes of the law itself, and their bringing in this amount can not be justified, as I stated a few days ago, by the testimony that was offered. Any man who will read those hearings must inevitably come to the conclusion that the fixing of this amount at \$1,000,000 was purely capricious on the part of the committee. It is not based on the evidence or on the necessities of the service. According to the testimony, 52 per cent of all the recruits now in the Army since this vocational system went into effect came in on the bases of the assurance and promise that they would receive it. In other words, that was the moving cause that induced them to enlist in the Army of the United States. They believed they would have the advantage of a thorough system of vocational training under a sufficient number of teachers and instructors to guarantee them the benefits of the law provided by the Congress. It is not fair to these young men who enlisted in the service on the face of that assurance to cripple the service so that the vocational training will be administered in an inefficient and haphazard manner, as all of the testimony here shows it would be by limiting the appropriation to \$1,000,000.

Of course I am in sympathy, as most gentlemen here generally are, with this crusade for economy, but there are some branches of the service where, if you are going to carry it out in good faith and efficiently, with credit to the Government, you must make sufficient appropriations or else abolish the system itself. That is the only appeal that I am making to the judgment of the members of this committee. I think they should take the testimony of the men who are chargeable with the administration of this law. They submitted an estimate on the basis of an Army of 280,000 men of \$11,000,000 this year. They submitted a minimum estimate for an Army of 175,000 of \$5,750,000. The friends of this system are willing to accept the appropriation carried in the present fiscal year and fix it at the same amount carried for the years 1920 and 1921.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman realizes that for an Army of 150,000 men, if everyone took vocational training, it would mean \$666 a year per man. I went through college and so did the gentleman on less than that and purchased my board and clothing.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I understand. When I was in college my expenses were only about \$300 or \$400 a year at a State institution where I had to pay no tuition, but that was a different time from this, as the gentleman will recognize. I imagine the gentlemen on this committee will make an attack upon the number of civilian instructors that are carried by the board and probably will undertake to justify their action by saying that there are too many civilian employees; but, as the testimony shows, the work of education is a work for which Army officers were not equipped.

You may as well say that these civilian educators could run the Army, as that military officers not trained and equipped for the purposes of instruction would be as good experts on this question as a few exclusively high-grade civilian employees.

And the testimony, if gentlemen would take time to read it, would show that the employment of a considerable number of civilian employees is entirely justified under the necessities of this system. I trust, gentlemen, that if you see fit to reject the amendment to increase the amount of the appropriation, which I think in all justice to these young men, and, as I say, to the Government itself, and to the Army officers who are responsible for its execution, you should not—if you should see fit to keep the appropriation at \$1,000,000, which I hope you will not do, I sincerely trust that you will adopt the other amendment cutting out these provisos, for I am informed by Gen. Hahn that if you do that you will practically destroy the efficiency and the effectiveness of the system, because by these limitations you will require those who are charged with the administration of this law to cease the employment of any man whose salary exceeds \$3,000 per annum, and you will limit to \$50,000 the amount of money expended for salaries other than of officers of the Army of the United States. These are absolutely fatal provisos, and, I think, destroy the purposes of the educational act itself by stripping the Army officers of a most essential instrumentality for its proper execution.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I wish to speak in opposition to the amendment. I think instead of increasing the amount of the appropriation for this item it should be reduced entirely if not cut out altogether. Some of these gentlemen who are connected as teachers have been so impressed with the squandering of this money that they have written to Members of Congress calling their attention to the fact and pointing out the manner in which money is being worse than wasted. I have before me a list of the men and women who are employed in this vocational and recreational service in the War Department, and there are 190 of them. I have their names, the location, and the amount of money they are receiving. They are drawing down, all told, \$674,780 a year. Their salaries range all the way from \$2,500 to \$9,000 a year, by far the greater number of them drawing salaries in excess of \$5,000 per annum. These people are employed part of the time in teaching. They employ part of their time in being taught and part of their time in going from one end of this country to the other, where they are receiving lectures from very high-priced lecturers. They are being instructed in psychology so as to teach these soldier boys psychology by gentlemen who are being paid as high as \$9,000 a year to teach these teachers psychology.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. On page 833 of the hearings appears the names of all these high-priced civilian employees. It absolutely does not give the names of any employee who is receiving a higher salary than \$6,000 per annum.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I can give the name of one man, and his name is C. R. Mann, who is chairman of the Advisory Board, who is receiving \$750 a month, which amounts to \$9,000 a year.

Mr. BLANTON. That gentleman's name ought to be worth that much.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Well, perhaps that is so, but as I stated awhile ago this money to my mind is worse than wasted for the reason it is attracting young men from all over this country into the Army with the belief that they are going to receive an education that will fit them for some active pursuit in life after they go out of the Army. It is admitted, and the hearings will disclose, by those gentlemen who are in charge of this educational training in the Army that less than 25 per cent of the people's money that is appropriated is employed, and expended in the act of teaching of these boys, either vocational or otherwise. Most of it is absolutely frittered away, and if this appropriation of \$1,000,000 is to stand these limitations certainly must stand, and these high-price salaries no longer be paid to men who admit themselves that they are not earning the money they are receiving, and I know of at least two letters which have been written from men whose conscience has so condemned them that they felt it was their duty to speak out and let the country know how this money is being squandered. They gather in Chicago, and they go from one end of the country to the other for the purpose of being lectured to, these teachers, by men who are supposed to teach them how to teach the fundamentals to these boys who are enlisted in the Army.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, we now have before us two propositions in addition to the committee figures of \$1,000,000. On the one hand it is proposed to increase it to \$3,500,000, and on the other hand to wipe it out entirely.

Now, the committee, I am sure—certainly I was not myself—were not in the attitude pictured by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. We are not unfriendly to the operation of this system as intended in the law. I can only speak for myself, and personally I am very friendly to a profitable use of the time of the soldier that is not needed for the performance of his military duties. I am friendly to instruction that is incidental to his military service, but I am not a believer that his military service should be a mere incident to the securing of an education.

They have had for vocational training during the present year \$3,500,000, and the experts that the gentleman from Alabama says we should follow made up their program for the year to come on the basis of \$10,000,000. The War Department did not permit them to submit that figure, but one of approximately five and one-half million dollars, and the committee felt obliged to cut that to \$1,000,000, not to destroy the work but to keep it within its proper boundaries.

Now, I will give the itemization the gentlemen presented to us in support of their five and one-half million dollar program. Of that amount, \$2,990,000 was for salaries of civilians. It being the judgment of the subcommittee that they were not necessary

to a proper program of this kind, we thought we could cut out there substantially \$3,000,000. The other items: Construction and repair, \$400,000; equipment and supplies, \$1,794,500; traveling expenses, civilian employees, \$100,000; printing and binding, \$345,000; miscellaneous, \$100,000; making a total of \$5,729,500. And if you will add the waste in these items to the cut in civilian pay you can cut it down to \$1,000,000. We are appropriating here for 150,000 men in the Army, while the Navy is to have 100,000 men. The Navy the current year had \$800,000 to cover not only this purpose of education but also recreation, and, in my judgment, they have a better recreation program in the Navy than they have in the Army and just as good an educational program.

Mr. DEMPSEY. And about the same number of men.

Mr. CRAMTON. One hundred thousand, as I have stated. There is one reason why the Navy can perform the work better for \$800,000 than the Army does for \$3,500,000, and that is this waste of civilian salaries.

What does the Navy have this year? Twenty-three civilians, paid by the Government, and they expect next year to have only six, and there is no demand anywhere for an increase of the \$800,000 for the Navy. Let me illustrate the waste of the Army. The Navy is doing a splendid work, and so the Army went to them. On page 104 of the hearings on the 1922 Navy appropriation bill, Admiral Washington states:

Capt. Sellers is the director of the whole division, but Mr. Alderman is confined entirely to the schools. * * * The Army, I might add, has offered Mr. Alderman \$1,000 more if he will leave us and come over to them.

If they take Mr. Alderman and have no other civilians, I think they could afford to pay him the amount. To illustrate the extravagance of this matter—

Mr. BANKHEAD. How much do they pay Mr. Alderman?

Mr. CRAMTON. Six thousand five hundred dollars.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But you propose to limit all salaries of civilians in this work in the Army to \$3,000?

Mr. CRAMTON. Their extravagance in this direction is so great that such action seems necessary. But if placed on the Navy basis I would not oppose a proper salary for a man of the type Mr. Alderman seems to be.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Is it not a fact that this department in the Army has robbed a number of our agricultural schools, such as the Kansas school, by offering salaries much higher than they can afford to pay?

Mr. CRAMTON. I am not advised definitely as to that. There is one thing I would like to mention. My friend from Alabama, who wants this increased to \$3,500,000, explained to the House yesterday he did not want a penny of it spent to teach an illiterate to read and write the English language or a foreigner to speak the English language. But he would spend millions in higher education in the Army, where to even teach a man to read and write they must hire civilians.

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this move for an increase of this appropriation, although in doing so I am not unmindful of both sides of this question. I was surprised in hearing some remarks made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]—I believe it was on yesterday—about the conditions in the Army, when at the same time here in the city of Washington they were showing a squad of soldiers who had been enlisted a little more than a year, all of them boys who before they enlisted could not read or write the English language, as prize products of this educational system in the Army. And one of them, from South Carolina, in particular, said:

I lived on a farm all my life, and I dreamed of a time when I could go to school. My father refused to allow me to attend school. I joined the Army against his protest, but I am proud now that I can read and write the English language.

He was a fine-looking soldier—a typical American boy.

On the other hand, these Government utilities once started keep growing in volume and numbers and in demands to such an extent that they overdo the thing, and bring on the destruction which is probably due them.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRAGO. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does not the gentleman think that if the Army would employ its officers as teachers of this work they could get along without the excessive appropriations we are proposing?

Mr. CRAGO. I am very much in favor of that, and I have urged it on the Army officers.

Mr. MADDEN. They do it in the Navy. They do not employ any outside instructors in the Navy, except five or six people, while in the Army they need the large appropriation because the Army thinks they should employ civilians to do that work.

Mr. CRAGO. That is all too true, and I am of the opinion that is what they must come to in the Army. Their ambition to extend this department, I think, is illustrated by a little pamphlet that Brother GREENE and myself discovered at Camp Eustis the other day. A remark like this was made, "That military duties will not be allowed to interfere with the educational work."

That shows the absurdity of it, and it shows the enthusiasm with which these men will attempt to build up and extend this great field of endeavor. Now, since we have practically stopped recruiting, or will stop, of course a greater sum will not be needed, but I assume that there is too much of a cut made in making this appropriation only \$1,000,000. The men who have studied the subject and are acquainted with the work of instruction say, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has pointed out, that the work will be interrupted and almost lost if it is not continued, although we have agreed with these young men that they will continue this work. For that reason I think for this year, at least, notwithstanding our economy program, it will be money well expended if we shall carry on this work in such shape that a great part of it may be done by the officers themselves, but I think that the work itself as started may well be continued. [Applause.]

Mr. WALSH rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] asks for one minute. There is only five minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is recognized.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I think this entire provision might well be stricken from the national defense act. It has grown to such proportions that it is going to impose increasing demands upon the taxpayers of this country in order to carry out the program. We ought to enlist men in the Army to make soldiers of them, not to increase their efficiency as bakers, or blacksmiths, or bookkeepers, or electricians, or these various other arts and trades. They ought to be trained along military lines, so that if their services shall be needed in the future their military training will be of some use to them.

This proposal here is not to increase the military efficiency of the Army, but it is to educate men along lines other than military lines, so that when they get out of the military service there is no inducement for them to continue or to reenlist. They will get practically a university education, so that they can go out and compete with other boys who have had to pay for their education, while these boys in the Army acquire it at Government expense, and the Government also pays them while they are in the Army. I submit that, despite the pathetic plea of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], we ought to stop now in the employment of this horde of civilian instructors, and if there is any need for the instruction of these boys in other lines after their military duties are performed, the officers in the Army ought to be competent enough for us to say that they shall give them the education in other lines if they have time after their recreations have been attended to.

Why, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAGO] read a letter here that would lead you to believe that before we can have efficient soldiers in the future, they have got to attend some pink teas to be taken care of by hostesses. We need a little more blood and iron in the soldiers of the Republic [applause], and a little less of this society stuff and moving-picture films, such as they have been led to expect. [Applause.] That may be all right in time of war, when there is a great stress on, and a great emergency, but in peace times I submit we should lend our efforts toward making an efficient military force, and let the boys when they leave the service look after their own education, the same as the boys not in the service have to do. They have to pay for it, but these boys in the service acquire it at the expense of the taxpayers. Uncle Sam is giving them the education, and the military efficiency and training are mere incidents. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] is recognized for one minute.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I want to make just one little statement. We are all familiar with the experience we have had in regard to legislation for the various departments. They start out on some special activity by asking us for one table with a typewriter on it and a red-headed girl to run it, and they give us to understand that they will stop there. [Laughter.] The next year they ask us to give them a little more, and the next year a little more, and so on; and in 10 years we have almost a new Cabinet department, developed from the little project that once started with the table and the typewriter and the red-headed girl to run it. [Laughter.]

The cost of the Army is stated as the great burden of "militarism." The total amount expended for the War Department and for the maintenance of the Army is divided by the number of soldiers that are in the Army, and, whatever the quotient is, it is said that it costs so much to maintain a soldier, and that that is "militarism."

If you include in the cost of the Army all these extraneous activities and the items for vocational training, you will find that millions and millions of dollars are spent for such things in the support of the Army to-day, yet people refer to that total cost as the cost of "militarism." And, as I said, dividing the total expenditures by the number of soldiers, they say it is costing so much for "militarism" per soldier.

Then the economists come along and tell us that the way to reduce the burden of "militarism" on the country is to cut off so many soldiers. That is not the place. Yesterday you cut down the number of soldiers. You are not getting at the root of the expense. The expense which makes this so-called burden of "militarism" that people rant about is in these interior activities, many of which are not a part of military science and training at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman yield back the balance of his time?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BANKHEAD: Page 44, line 2, strike out the figures "\$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$3,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment. The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BANKHEAD) there were—ayes 8, noes 48.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BANKHEAD: Page 44, line 5, after the word "instructors," strike out all of lines 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and line 10 down to and including the words "per annum."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

QUARTERMASTER SUPPLIES AND SERVICES FOR RIFLE RANGES FOR CIVILIAN INSTRUCTION.

To establish and maintain indoor and outdoor rifle ranges for the use of all able-bodied males capable of bearing arms, under reasonable regulations to be prescribed by the national board for the promotion of rifle practice and approved by the Secretary of War; for the employment of labor in connection with the establishment of outdoor and indoor rifle ranges, including labor in operating targets; for the employment of instructors; for clerical services; for badges and other insignia; for the transportation of employees, instructors, and civilians to engage in practice; for the purchase of materials, supplies, and services, and for expenses incidental to instruction of citizens of the United States in marksmanship, and their participation in national and international matches, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, and to remain available until expended, \$100,000: *Provided*, That out of the said sum of \$100,000 there may be expended for the payment of transportation, for supplying meals, or furnishing commutation of subsistence of civilian rifle teams authorized by the Secretary of War to participate in the national matches, not to exceed \$80,000: *Provided further*, That hereafter members of civilian rifle teams may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be paid, as commutation of traveling expenses, at the rate of 5 cents per mile for the shortest usually traveled route from their homes to national matches, when authorized to participate therein by the Secretary of War and for the return travel thereto: *Provided further*, That the payment of travel pay for the return journey may be made in advance of the actual performance of travel.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. McCLINTIC. That it is legislation on an appropriation bill unauthorized by existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a long paragraph. It will aid the Chair if the gentleman will point to the parts of it that are objectionable.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I call attention to the provisos which relate to payment of traveling expenses of civilian rifle teams.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I think the activities provided for in this paragraph are authorized in the Army reorganization act.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Kansas inform the Chair where he can find the act?

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this matter may be passed over temporarily until we find the authorization either in the national defense act or in the Army reorganization act.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The paragraph will be passed over to be returned to later.

Mr. MADDEN. Before it is passed over, if I may, I should like to offer an amendment and have it pending.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is pending. Without objection, the gentleman may propose his amendment and have it read for information.

Mr. MADDEN. I should like to have it pending for the information of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. It can not be pending when a point of order is pending, but by unanimous consent it may be read for the information of the House.

Mr. MADDEN. I will offer it later.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES.

For the procurement and issue as provided in section 55-c of the act approved June 4, 1920, and in section 1225, Revised Statutes, as amended, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, to schools and colleges, other than those provided for in section 40 of the act above referred to, of such arms, tentage, and equipment, including the transporting of same, and the overhauling and repair of personal equipments, machine-gun outfits, and horse equipments, as the Secretary of War shall deem necessary for proper military training in said schools and colleges, \$10,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of arms or other ordnance equipment.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Under the discussion of the vocational item I did not have the opportunity of making an observation that I wanted to make. While acting on the Commission of Vocational Training we had before the commission some of the persons attached to the Army and the Government sent by Cabinet members, and they were discussing the field of both the Army and the Navy for vocational activities. We understood at that time that both the Army and Navy as organized would offer splendid chances to the boys who were enlisted for a limited period, to be trained for some trade when they left the Army or Navy. It never occurred to me as one member of the commission that it would entail a large employment of persons outside of both the Army and the Navy. We were told that if the Army wanted to build a bridge there were not any finer engineers in the world than would be found in the Army to do the work, and to instruct along that line, and we took it as a general statement of the ability of the expert men in the Army and the Navy, that they could take charge of this training. Few can understand how much surprised I was when in the defense act we had provided \$75,000 for the organization of this work and started it, and the very next year they came in and asked for \$10,000,000 for the work. We wanted to know where that \$10,000,000 was to be used.

It was an organization going outside of the Army, and really you are going to turn the Army into a school, into a university, and that was to be one of the primary features of going into the Army.

Now, I confess I am not in favor of that. I think it is entirely out of order. I do think, however, and presume that a million dollars is a sufficient amount of money—I do think that when a young man goes into the Army or the Navy if he can be trained for a trade when he comes out he is better equipped to do something than before he went in, it is a splendid thing to do. I would object to turning the Army or the Navy into a school except as those facilities now in the Army and Navy can be used for the betterment of the boy in other branches of the service.

I want to say that as the chairman of the Committee on Education I am interested in all matters pertaining to education, but I think that they ought to be trained as I have said.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the appropriation was increased from \$75,000 one year to a million dollars the next year?

Mr. FESS. The first year it was \$75,000 and then they asked for \$10,000,000, but we only gave them \$2,000,000, which indicated what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAIG] said, that you start a thing of this kind at a small expense and it grows away beyond what the provisions of the law intended it to be.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. The gentleman was one of the promoters of the educational vocational system?

Mr. FESS. I was.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does it not bear this distinction, that under that system the boy is paying for his education and under the Army proposition he is required to go to school?

Mr. FESS. Under the vocational system it is made a part of the public-school system, so that the boy does not have to pay; it is free like the public schools. I think it is important to understand, however, that if we do not keep our hand on these activities they will run away beyond us, and that is why I am not in favor of this.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, on the 4th day of February, 1861, Congress had before it for consideration a bill for the organization of the Territory now comprising the State of Colorado. At that time all of that region was known as the Pikes Peak country. By the bill providing for the creation, establishment, and organization of a Territorial form of government the bill as it passed the House of Representatives named it the Territory of Idaho. When the bill went to the Senate there was an extended discussion concerning whether or not it would be slave or free territory and also as to the name of the Territory, and after considerable debate the Senate amended the bill and changed the name of the Territory from Idaho to the Territory of Colorado, "for the reason that the Colorado River arose in its mountains and there was a peculiar fitness in the name," and also because "the name Colorado is more appropriate and more harmonious, and is the handsomest name that could be given to any Territory or State." That was 60 years ago to-day that Colorado was christened [applause], and from that day to this every loyal son and daughter of the Centennial State has proudly echoed that sentiment, that it is the handsomest name that could be given to any Territory or State. The Colorado River was named by the early Spanish explorers of the Southwest something like two centuries or more ago, and our State is proud to bear the beautiful name of that most wonderful river which has possibly the most weird and fascinating history and scenery of any river in the world. For the purpose of submitting a few further remarks on the name Colorado and that river within our borders, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record upon House joint resolution 460, "to change the name of the Grand River in Colorado and Utah to the Colorado River." [Applause.]

Mr. McCLINTIC. I object.

Mr. BLANTON. In honor of this natal day, will not the Chairman give us a little time this evening to catch up with our mail? [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma objects.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I ask unanimous consent to revise my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has that right anyway.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I ask to return to the item on line 18, page 44: "Quartermaster supplies and services for rifle ranges for civilian instruction."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has that right.

Mr. ANTHONY. I call the attention of the Chair to section 113 of the National defense act, page 52, where provision is made for the encouragement of rifle practice. Congress is expressly authorized to make appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Is there any provision in the act which provides that rifle teams may draw 5 cents a mile from their homes to the national matches, as provided for in the proviso on page 45?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think under the language of this act Congress would have the right to appropriate for the expenses of that team.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I do not think the act specifies that authority is granted, and I think the point of order is good.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. McCLINTIC. My point of order is to the two provisos found on page 45, that they are not authorized by any existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The first paragraph of the proviso the gentleman refers to is in order, and the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. McCLINTIC. The second proviso has the word "hereafter" in it.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the second paragraph is permanent law. That was carried in the bill last year, and this is a mere repetition.

Mr. ANTHONY. It can very well be dropped out.

The CHAIRMAN. It appears to be legislation on its face.

Mr. GOOD. The language should go out on a motion, and not on a point of order, because last year we provided that here-

after that should be done, and they have restated the language this year. It is not subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not been cited to that provision in the law.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I would be very glad to explain the matter to the Chair. The way it happens to be in the bill is this: It was made permanent law at 5 cents, and they come back and ask that it be made at 6½ cents. The 6½ cents was rejected and we retained the 5 cents and simply overlooked the fact that the language ought not to be repeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair finds that the language was enacted into law last year.

Mr. ANTHONY. June 5, 1920.

The CHAIRMAN. And should not be in this bill at all, and the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the language beginning, in line 16, with the word "provided" down to the bottom of the page.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANTHONY: Page 45, line 16, after "\$80,000," strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MADDEN: Page 44, line 24, after the word "was," strike out the remainder of line 24, on page 44, and all of lines 1 and 2 and line 3 to and including the word "instructors," on page 45.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to make it impossible in the future to employ civilian instructors or labor on the rifle ranges. I believe that the work on the rifle ranges ought to be done by military instructors and that the labor ought to be done by soldiers. This is purely a military activity, and it ought not to require men who are not connected with the Army to conduct it. It seems to me that the time has come when we should, as far as possible, do away with the employment of civilian labor in connection with the work of the Army.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that this is largely a civilian proposition, not connected directly with the Army. It is for rifle ranges for civilian instruction.

Mr. MADDEN. At the same time, they are rifle ranges for military instruction to civilians. It is presumably all done under the direction of the Army.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think it would cost us considerably more money to have to send officers and men around to the different places where this rifle practice is being conducted. It would mean that we would have to establish soldiers in hundreds of different places in the country to carry on this activity.

Mr. MADDEN. I presume that is being done now.

Mr. ANTHONY. No; not more than one instructor, perhaps, and very few of them.

Mr. MADDEN. Then the rifle ranges ought to be so located as to give opportunity for civilian instruction in rifle practice at ranges where military instructors are in attendance.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I am in sympathy with the general policy contemplated. We are getting rid of as many civilians as possible who are in the Army. At one time, when the Military Committee still had jurisdiction over appropriations, in a hearing it was suggested to us that one of the reasons for this thing was to develop practice in marksmanship in communities where there were no people of the military profession to give instructions, the intention being to stimulate the military idea of marksmanship in those regions and to develop a high standard of proficiency which it was desirable to inculcate as near as possible in a sportsmanship idea of target practice, in order to get accomplished marksmen in civil life interested in the subject.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, if the introduction of this amendment has elicited, as it has, the very wise suggestions made by the military experts of the House, I think I have accomplished some good by offering it. If it is unwise to attempt to pass it, and the practice is to be continued and is thought to be wise, I am willing to withdraw my amendment, and I do so, with the consent of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I send an amendment to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. McCLINTIC: Page 44, beginning in line 18, strike out the paragraph.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, on that I wish to be heard. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in practically every State in the Union we have our National Guard. If this paragraph is included in the bill it closes the incentive in every community to a certain extent for the organization of a local military company. In practically every State in the Union to-day we have local rifle ranges at places where the local State National Guard encampments are held. The National Guard is very necessary in order to preserve and protect certain conditions in every State in the Union. I can see no reason why a bill of this kind would include a paragraph which if enacted into law has the indirect effect of destroying or nearly destroying the National Guard and the National Guard units, and it is for that reason that I have offered this amendment and hope that all the Members who are interested in the preservation of the National Guard will vote against any movement which takes away the functions of that organization.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENGINEER SCHOOL.

Equipment and maintenance of the Engineer School, including purchase and repair of instruments, machinery, implements, models, boats, and materials for the use of the school and to provide means for the theoretical and practical instruction of Engineer officers and troops in their special duties as sappers and miners; for land mining, pontooning, and signaling; for purchase and binding of scientific and professional works, papers, and periodicals treating on military engineering and scientific subjects, textbooks and books of reference for the library of the United States Engineer School; for incidental expenses of the school, including chemicals, stationery, hardware, machinery, and boats; for pay of civilian clerks, draftsmen, electricians, mechanics, and laborers; compensation of civilian lecturers and payment of tuition fees of student officers at civil technical institutions; for unforeseen expenses; for travel expenses of officers on journeys approved by the Secretary of War and made for the purpose of instruction: *Provided*, That the traveling expenses herein provided for shall be in lieu of mileage and other allowances; and for other absolutely necessary expenses: *Provided further*, That section 3648, Revised Statutes, shall not apply to subscriptions for foreign and professional newspapers and periodicals to be paid for from this appropriation, \$30,000.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. I notice you have cut the amount for the Engineering School \$30,000, which is \$10,000 under the appropriation granted for a number of the other schools. I would like to know why that was done.

Mr. ANTHONY. On the ground that the normal activities of the Engineer School does not demand as much money as some of the other schools we have provided for. The number of men under instruction would be very much less than in some of the other schools.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the amount provided for in this appropriation take care of the young men whom the department desires to have sent to these technical schools?

Mr. ANTHONY. We thought it was. I suppose the gentleman refers to the half-baked classes of officers who were let out from West Point with only a year or two of instruction up there, who are now commissioned in the Army and who need this additional instruction.

Mr. McKENZIE. I will say to the gentleman that if these young men to whom he refers to as half-baked were commissioned before they were fully prepared I think it would be a wise expenditure of money to send them to some school.

Mr. ANTHONY. It is our understanding that about 40 or 50 young Engineer officers who had incomplete education at West Point would be sent to such institutions as the Boston Tech and the Rensselaer Polytech to complete their education, and we have provided enough to pay their tuition at those places. Their other expenses are taken care of out of their pay and allowances.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENGINEER OPERATIONS IN THE FIELD.

For expenses incident to military engineer operations in the field, including the purchase of material and a reserve of material for such operations, the construction or rental of storehouses within and outside the District of Columbia, the purchase, operation, maintenance, and repair of horse-drawn and motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and such expenses as are ordinarily provided for under appro-

priations for "Engineer depots," "Civilian assistants to engineer officers," and "Maps, War Department," \$250,000: *Provided*, That when to the interest of the Government funds appropriated under this head may be used for the purchase of options on materials for use in engineer operations in the field: *Provided further*, That so much of this appropriation as is necessary to provide facilities for engineer training of troops may be expended for military construction work of a temporary character at camps and cantonments and in training areas for training purposes only.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the committee why he has carried an item here for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles when the gentleman contended on the floor that the Secretary of War has got thousands of those vehicles and directing him to sell not less than 1,000 of them? What is the sense of appropriating more money to pay for them?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say to the gentleman that that is the usual language of the paragraph that has been carried in the bill from year to year. We also have a proviso on one of the other pages of the bill that no motor vehicle shall be purchased out of any funds in this act unless for experimental purposes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, does the gentleman mean to say that in making up this appropriation bill he has a hard-boiled lot of language which he carries along in it whether he means it or not?

Mr. ANTHONY. It has been carried for years.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is that any reason why we should keep on carrying it?

Mr. ANTHONY. But an emergency might come up next year or the year after and we would want to buy something, and for that reason we have left it in.

Mr. CONNALLY. Could we not put it in the next bill if we needed it?

Mr. ANTHONY. It would be possible, but we create a situation by which the proviso is left in—

Mr. CONNALLY. I would like to call attention to the fact that that might be changed in the Senate or in conference.

Mr. ANTHONY. I would say to the gentleman that we could not buy for experimental purposes unless we had the authorization in the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. They are not for experimental purposes—these passenger-carrying vehicles.

Mr. ANTHONY. But the proviso limits them to that.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out the language, "the purchase," in lines 14 and 15 of the bill, on page 53.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CONNALLY: Page 53, strike out the words "the purchase."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 15, yeas 21.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CONNALLY: Page 53, line 10, strike out the paragraph.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, we have just had an illustration of the fact that the majority side of this House in handling this subject of Army automobiles does not mean what it has been pretending to mean for the past two years. The Committee on War Expenditures, which is now in session, and has been in session intermittently for about 18 months, has filed this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from time to time with tirades against the War Department because it has not disposed of the thousands of automobiles now the property of the department. Gentlemen have pretended to believe that the department was derelict in its duty, and I am not taking issue with that statement. I think it ought to dispose of these useless passenger-carrying automobiles; but when an amendment is proposed to an appropriation bill on the floor of this House striking out the language providing for the purchase of new automobiles we are presented with the spectacle of the gentleman in charge of this bill opposing an amendment, and the majority side of this House, which has been blatant throughout the press and on the stump in the interest of economy and for retrenchment, against appropriating more money for passenger-carrying vehicles, want to appropriate more money

for such vehicles, when we know that there are now in the War Department thousands of those vehicles that are not used. What is the justification? The gentleman on the Appropriations Committee said that the reason for carrying this language was that they have been doing it for years, and they are afraid if they would drop out one item of appropriation they would forget to put it in next year.

Mr. MADDEN. The record shows that they have about 4,000 passenger-carrying automobiles in the War Department now, and this bill directs that they shall sell a thousand of those.

Mr. GARNER. Why do you carry an authorization for these things in this item?

Mr. MADDEN. To give them the right to buy something for experimental purposes.

Mr. CONNALLY. They put it over in one part of the bill to sell automobiles and in another part of the bill to buy automobiles.

Mr. ANTHONY. Has the gentleman read the proviso on page 34?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; I have read the proviso on page 34.

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not see how you could make the English language any plainer. It says that the Army shall not buy another automobile except for experimental purposes.

Mr. CONNALLY. If that is true, why are you appropriating in this section to buy more automobiles?

Mr. ANTHONY. We want to give the department the right, if anything comes up that is new, to experiment with it.

Mr. CONNALLY. You do not limit them to that.

Mr. ANTHONY. Absolutely.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am talking about page 53.

Mr. ANTHONY. I am talking about page 34.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is in another section of this bill, and if the gentleman does not mean to purchase automobiles for the use of the Engineer Department, he ought to say so in this bill.

Mr. ANTHONY. It shows the intent of this act.

Mr. CONNALLY. If he does not intend to buy automobiles, on page 53, why does not the committee strike it out of the bill? You want to march up the hill and then down again.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman does not maintain that the restriction in the proviso on page 34 covers every item in the act, does he?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that it is conceivable that over in the Senate that provision on page 34 might be changed. But the House ought not to provide in this section for the purchase of something that you say you do not intend to purchase.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman very well knows that if it is changed in the other body it will go to conference, and it may be considered a fair inference that the body that placed this language in the bill will resist the other body if the other body changes it.

Mr. CONNALLY. The gentleman simply wants to shift the power of enacting legislation into the hands of the conference committee. We ought to say what we mean, and I am pleading with the majority on this side of the House to really say what you mean and strike out this language for the purchase of automobiles.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to think that my good-natured friend and very efficient Member of the House, as exemplified by his able method of handling this bill, is not entirely candid. I think he ought to be frank and admit that by an oversight the committee has used language in this bill that he has not intended it to use.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman point it out?

Mr. WINGO. Yes. That is the language which authorizes specifically, on page 53, the "purchase, operation, maintenance, and repair of horse-drawn and motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles."

The gentleman has said that he has put in a limitation. I presume the only limitation is that on page 34:

That none of the funds appropriated or made available under this act or any of the unexpended balances of any other act shall be used for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger or freight-carrying vehicles for the Army, except those that are purchased solely for experimental purposes.

Is it not? There is the language—

for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger or freight-carrying vehicles for the Army, except those that are purchased solely for experimental purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I have made some little study of the law. I am preparing to study law still further, although I have been practicing for 20 years. Somewhere I have heard of this rule, that a specific provision overrides and controls a general provision. I am still not enough of a lawyer to state it in legal language, but the able and accomplished lawyers on that side of the House know what I am talking about. [Laughter.]

Seriously, gentlemen, a lawyer who has enough sense to replevin a mule knows that in spite of this language on page 34 you specifically authorize the purchase of motor-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles for any purpose they see fit, regardless of whether it is for experimental purposes or not. The department officer who would rule otherwise would have to stultify all the legal rules of interpretation.

I think you have gone on and carried the same language that was carried before. As to what you have done I think you gentlemen are acting in good faith. You want to hold them down to the purchase simply for experimental purposes, and I think that is right. But when you put a specific authorization in there, it will override the general limitation. [Applause.]

There is no question about that. Of course in the end this bill will not be written as it is written here. It will be rewritten in conference. I suggest that the gentleman from Kansas look into this matter and draw a provision to limit the right of the Army to purchase motor-drawn vehicles. Of course this is just like this other idea of cutting down the size of the Army to 150,000 men. Everybody knows that the appropriation does not control. The only practical way to reduce the Army is for the Committee on Military Affairs to bring in an amendment to the Army reorganization act and cut down the military force. You are not going to deceive the country by playing this game of pussy wants a corner and working both ends against the middle and making a play of economy when you are not in fact acting like it. This is only an example of what might be expected by men who have had experience in what has been done heretofore. When you went back to the old system of having a committee of 35 men to undertake to inquire into and investigate and determine the propriety of appropriations aggregating \$4,000,000,000, we knew it would fall down, just as it fell down 36 years ago, when the expenditures of the Government were only one-eighth of what they are now.

I do not blame the gentleman from Kansas. He is a very able man. I think in fact he is one of the ablest men on that side of the House; but he would have to be a superman if he could go through the requirements of the Army and in a short time without aid determine what the Army requires. I understand this bill is the child of his brain and his alone, and I congratulate the country that he has been as able and efficient and strong as he has, because it is a test of physical endurance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of saying to the gentleman from Arkansas and the gentleman from Texas that if it will make for their peace of mind, the committee really has no objection to the word "purchase" going out. It was simply desired to protect the standing language of the bill. If the gentleman will withdraw his amendment to strike out the entire paragraph, I will consent to the word "purchase" going out.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Supposing the word "purchase" is stricken out from that section of the bill, would there then be any authority in the bill for the purchase of the type of automobiles provided for in the proviso on page 34, for engineer operations in the field?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; they could not buy any experimental trucks for engineer operations in the field.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That is the point exactly.

Mr. ANTHONY. But the committee has no knowledge that they intend to buy any.

Mr. Sisson. I know that no member of the subcommittee has any objection to the word "purchase" going out. By unanimous consent, we might let the word "purchase" be stricken out of the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I ask to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Reserving the right to object, I think the gentleman's suggestion will not take away from the Engineer Corps the right to buy for experimental purposes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I have asked the chairman of the committee about that.

Mr. WINGO. If the gentleman will refer to page 34 he will see this language:

And provided further, That none of the funds appropriated or made available under this act or any of the unexpended balances of any other act shall be used for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger or freight-carrying vehicles for the Army except those that are purchased solely for experimental purposes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. But where are your funds that may be used for the purposes of purchasing? You have taken out the authority to purchase anything. Therefore whether it is to be used in quantity or as an experimental type, there is no authority for engineering operations in the field to buy any vehicle for experimental purposes.

Mr. WINGO. There may be something in that.

Mr. ANTHONY. The paragraph under discussion is the only one under which the Engineer Corps could buy any.

Mr. JONES of Texas. On page 8 there is authorization for the purchase of motor-propelled vehicles.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is for the Signal Corps.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I think it will be found that that proviso is a blanket proviso that is intended to cover all the subsequent distributions of the purchase power throughout the bill under the several heads for which they are to be employed, and when you take out one of these from under any head, that head can not buy any.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the withdrawal of the amendment?

Mr. WALSH. I object to the withdrawal of the amendment.

Mr. ANTHONY. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the Army appropriation bill, H. R. 15943, had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

An act (S. 4432) to provide for awarding decorations, devices, or insignia to the next of kin of deceased persons who would have been entitled to receive the same, and making it unlawful for anyone other than the person authorized to do so to wear such decoration, device, or insignia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CHINDBLOM (at the request of Mr. BROOKS of Illinois) indefinitely, on account of illness.

INCREASE OF FORCE AND SALARIES IN THE PATENT OFFICE.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a conference report.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum present.

Mr. NOLAN. I desire to present a conference report for printing under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of no quorum present.

Mr. RAYBURN. If my colleague will withhold that, I have an inquiry that I wish to submit to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of no quorum present, Mr. Speaker, because it is now nearly 6 o'clock.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to be taken off my feet, and I insist on recognition.

The SPEAKER. If the point of no quorum is not made the gentleman from California insists he is entitled to recognition.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I will withhold it, unless there is action to be taken on the conference report.

Mr. NOLAN. I only present the conference report to be printed under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California presents the conference report to be printed under the rule, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11984) to increase the force and salaries in the Patent Office, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 4891. An act to amend section 1 of an act approved February 26, 1919, entitled "An act to fix the salaries of the clerks of the United States district courts and to provide for their office expenses, and for other purposes."

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 8881. An act for the relief of the First National Bank of New Carlisle, Ind.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 1789. An act for the relief of Thomas P. Darr;

H. R. 1790. An act for the relief of John K. Ashley, jr.;

H. R. 3210. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Prat;

H. R. 3522. An act for the relief of Lemuel Stokes;

H. R. 6221. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in the Osage civilization-fund claim of the Osage Nation of Indians against the United States;

H. R. 6301. An act for the relief of Nathan Manzer;

H. R. 7050. An act for the relief of the First State Bank of Kerrville, Kerr County, State of Texas;

H. R. 10920. An act declaring Platte River to be a nonnavigable stream;

H. R. 11066. An act for the relief of the Shipowners & Merchants' Tugboat Co.;

H. R. 12333. An act for the relief of Albert T. Huso;

H. R. 12441. An act for the relief of the Duluth, Winnipeg & Pacific Railroad; and

H. R. 13600. An act for the relief of Mrs. William B. Ryan.

HOOR OF MEETING NEXT WEEK.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that beginning next Monday, and for the balance of the week, the House meet at 11 o'clock a. m. I have conferred with a number of gentlemen on the minority side—ex-Speaker CLARK, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, and others—and they have no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that beginning next Monday, and for the balance of the week, the House meet at 11 o'clock a. m. Is there objection?

Mr. RAYBURN. Reserving the right to object, I have heard a good deal about the program, and I would like to ask the gentleman what is to be the program for next week? I have heard it stated that the Winslow bill is to be passed under suspension of the rules. I say candidly to the gentlemen that I voted to report the Winslow bill from the committee, but I do think that it is most unfair to try to pass a bill like that under suspension of the rules.

Mr. MONDELL. Passing bills under suspension is a matter for the Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. I will say to the gentleman that I do not think it can be passed under suspension.

Mr. MONDELL. Next Monday is suspension day, and of course some matters will undoubtedly be brought up under the suspension of the rules.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think the bill ought to come up, but it ought to come up in a way that would give us more than 20 minutes on a side, and so that it will be open for amendment. I do not think you can pass the bill under suspension anyway.

Mr. WINGO. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman's request is to start next Monday and until further orders?

Mr. MONDELL. No; for the balance of the week.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman state what bills are to be taken up next week?

Mr. MONDELL. It is our hope to take up and pass the balance of the appropriation bills.

Mr. WINGO. When does the gentleman intend to bring up the packers' control bill?

Mr. MONDELL. I can not inform the gentleman, because it has not been brought to my attention.

Mr. WINGO. I will bring it to the gentleman's attention now.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. WINGO. The regular order is the packers' bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that beginning next Monday for the balance of the week the House meet at 11 o'clock a. m. Is there objection? There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, February 5, 1921, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15994) providing for sundry matters affecting the Naval Establishment, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1291), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KAHN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 426) providing for the bringing to the United States of a body of an unknown American killed on the battle fields of France, and for the burial of the remains with appropriate ceremonies, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1292), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 1695) validating certain homestead entries, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1293), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SIEGEL, from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 369) admitting Emil S. Fischer to the rights and privileges of a citizen of the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1290), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14807) granting an increase of pension to Agnes B. Earl, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 16008) granting certain lands to Converse County, Wyo., for a public park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 16009) to authorize the United States, through the United States Shipping Board, to acquire a site on Hazzell Island, St. Thomas, Virgin Islands, for a fuel and fuel-oil station and fresh-water reservoir for Shipping Board and other merchant vessels, as well as United States naval vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 16010) to provide for the distribution of receipts by States under the provisions of section 17 of the act of Congress approved June 10, 1920, entitled "An act to create a Federal power commission; to provide for the improvement of navigation; the development of water power; the use of the public lands in relation thereto; and to repeal section 18 of the river and harbor appropriation act approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Water Power.

By Mr. RIDDICK: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, urging Congress to enact legislation increasing duty on flax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, protesting against the passage of the pending measures for regulation of packing industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 16011) for the relief of Charles W. Mugler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 16012) granting a pension to Annie Fay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 16013) to grant relief to the legal owner or owners of the American schooner *Blanche C. Pendleton*; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUFKIN: A bill (H. R. 16014) granting a pension to Clara E. Chase; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16015) granting a pension to Augustus E. Orbeton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16016) granting a pension to Harriet F. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16017) granting an increase of pension to Carrie A. Chaplin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16018) for the relief of Margaret F. Lane; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16019) for the relief of Franklin Madison; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16020) for the relief of Frank P. Hoyt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOIGT: Resolution (H. Res. 668) authorizing payment of six months' salary and funeral expenses to Ernest Wolf, on account of death of August G. Wolf, late an employee of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5485. By Mr. BEGG: Petition of members and friends of the Church of the Brethren, of near Tiffin, Ohio, urging prompt action on the Fess-Capper bill (H. R. 12652) by the committee; to the Committee on Education.

5486. By Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania: Petition of Eyster Weiser Co., of York, Pa., praying for relief for their company and for the railroads, as provided for in the Wilson bill (H. R. 15836); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5487. By Mr. DARROW: Petition of the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, urging the passage of House bill 15662; to the Committee on Patents.

5488. By Mr. ESCH: Petition of residents of Prairie du Sac, Wis., and Sauk County, Wis., favoring beer and light wines, and protesting against the Sunday blue laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5489. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Resolutions of Charles Steward Fanell Council, American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, Boston, Mass., Timothy Hynes, recording secretary, and of Terrence MacSwiney Council, American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, Lynn, Mass., protesting against the deportation of Lord Mayor Donal O'Callaghan, of Cork, Ireland; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5490. By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of the Society of the Third (Regular) Division, Brooklyn Branch No. 5, opposing any reduction of appropriations asked for care of disabled ex-service men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5491. Also, petition of the New York Produce Co., opposing the Gronna bill, S. 3944; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5492. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Henry L. Doherty & Co., New York City, favoring the Nolan bill; to the Committee on Patents.

5493. Also, petition of American Car & Foundry Export Co., of New York City, favoring the Winslow bill, H. R. 15836; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5494. Also, petition of the Associated Industries of New York State (Inc.), Buffalo, N. Y., favoring effective Government protection of threatened industries in the United States by the adoption of some former tariff laws or by limited emergency legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5495. By Mr. O'CONNOR: Petition of New Orleans Council, No. 714, Knights of Columbus, protesting against the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5496. By Mr. SCHALL: Petition of the Minnesota State Agricultural Society, urging the passage of the Lakes-to-ocean project; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

5497. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of certain citizens of Mandan, N. Dak., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5498. Also, petition of the Tri-State Grain Growers' Convention, at Fargo, N. Dak., urging the enactment of legislation that will stop speculation on the grain exchanges; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5499. By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition of 76 citizens of the State of Illinois, opposing the passage of the Smith-Towner bill creating a department of education; to the Committee on Education.

5500. Also, petition of 58 citizens of the State of Illinois, favoring the passage of an amendment to Volstead prohibition law that will permit the manufacture and sale of beer and light wines under reasonable restrictions, and also opposing the proposed Sunday blue laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5501. By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of the Minnesota State Agricultural Society, in respect to Lakes-to-ocean commerce; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

5502. By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Franco-American citizens of Rhode Island, opposing the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5503. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of District Lodge, No. 44, International Association of Machinists, favoring the Taylor system of so-called scientific management in shops operated directly by the Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5504. Also, petition of the Massachusetts Federation of Churches, Boston, Mass., favoring world disarmament, and no appropriation for increased armament until such an agreement has been reached; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5505. Also, petition of the American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, Terrence MacSwiney Council, of Lynn, Mass., protesting against the deportation of Lord Mayor Donal J. O'Callaghan; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5506. By Mr. VOIGT: Petition of residents of Hubertus, Wis., protesting against the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5507. Also, petition of citizens of Lonira, Wis., opposing the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5508. By Mr. WATSON: Petition of members of the Travelers' Club, of Bristol, Pa., favoring House bill 10925; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, February 5, 1921.

Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., the Chaplain, offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we bless Thee for the sunlight of another day. Grant that we may walk in the sun to-day and realize continually that whatever may happen to us we are under the guidance and direction of a Father who loves us. Hear and help us always. Through Jesus Christ. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Wednesday, February 2, 1921, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

FINAL ASCERTAINMENT OF ELECTORS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State transmitting, pursuant to law, certificates of the governors of Arkansas and South Carolina of the final ascertainment of electors for President and Vice President in their respective States at the election November 2, 1920, which were ordered to lie on the table.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES (S. DOC. NO. 374).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the president of the National Academy of Sciences, submitted, pursuant to law, for the year ended December 31, 1920, which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster General transmitting a report, in response to Senate resolution 434 of January 26, 1921, directing the Postmaster General to send to the Senate the names of all former service men recommended by him to the President for appointment as postmasters and by the President sent to the Senate.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask that the communication from the Postmaster General may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

There being no objection, the communication was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and, with the accompanying papers, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., February 1, 1921.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: Senate resolution 434 of January 26, 1921, directs the Postmaster General to submit to the Senate a list of the names of all former service men and the widows of such who have been recommended for appointment as postmasters and whose nominations have been submitted by the President to the Senate for confirmation, but have not yet been acted upon; also, the names and locations of the offices for which such nominations have been made; as well as the

names of all former service men, and the widows of such, who successfully passed the examinations for postmasters but were not recommended for appointment.

In compliance with the terms of the resolution, I transmit herewith a list of the names of first, second, and third class post offices where examinations were held by the Civil Service Commission in accordance with the provisions of the Executive order of March 31, 1917, and the names of the former service men, and the widows of such, whose nominations for appointment as postmasters at such offices have been submitted to the Senate but have not yet been acted upon. I inclose, also, a separate list of offices where examinations have been held in accordance with the provisions of the Executive order in question, and nominations for these offices have been submitted to the Senate but not yet acted upon, but in which cases the persons recommended for appointment are not former service men or the widows of such. This list shows the names of all applicants for these offices who passed successfully the examinations held by the Civil Service Commission, which applicant in each case was certified by the commission as entitled to preference on account of previous military service, and which applicant has been nominated for confirmation.

It is not understood from the Senate resolution that it applies to any cases except offices of the first, second, and third class, where examinations have been held in accordance with the terms of the Executive order above mentioned. Therefore, the department has not attempted to furnish information regarding the several hundred nominations which have been sent to the Senate, but not yet acted upon, of postmasters appointed as the result of examinations at fourth-class offices, which offices have now been advanced to the third class and the nominations of the postmasters for reappointment submitted to the Senate. It would require considerable time and a great amount of work to examine the old records for information regarding such postmasters, and in many of these cases it is likely that no information could be obtained by an examination of the old records to determine definitely whether they were formerly in the military or naval service.

The resolution does not call for the department's reasons for passing over the eligible entitled to preference in making the appointments on the second list mentioned in this letter, and it might be embarrassing to the applicants to have this information made public, but the department would gladly furnish it to the Senate in executive sessions or for the confidential use of the committee having charge of these nominations, if desired. In failing to appoint the applicants entitled to preference on account of military service in these cases the department has exercised its right under the Executive order of April 13, 1920, which provides that the veteran preference statutes shall apply in the selection of persons for appointment as postmaster at such offices, and that when the highest eligible certified by the Civil Service Commission is not a veteran, but a veteran is among those certified as eligible, the Postmaster General may submit to the President for nomination the name of either the highest eligible or the veteran obtaining the highest eligible rating, as the best interests of the service may require.

I inclose copies of the Executive orders of March 31, 1917, and April 13, 1920.

Very truly, yours,

A. S. BURLESON,
Postmaster General.

(No. 3258.)

EXECUTIVE ORDER.

The veteran preference statutes shall apply in the selection of persons for appointment as postmaster at offices of the first, second, and third classes. When the highest eligible certified to the Postmaster General by the Civil Service Commission is not a veteran but a veteran is among those certified as eligible, the Postmaster General may submit to the President for nomination the name of either the highest eligible or the veteran obtaining the highest eligible rating as the best interests of the service may require.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
13 April, 1920.

EXECUTIVE ORDER.

Hereafter when a vacancy occurs in the position of postmaster of any office of the first, second, or third class as the result of death, resignation, removal, or, on the recommendation of the First Assistant Postmaster General, approved by the Postmaster General, to the effect that the efficiency or needs of the service requires that a change shall be made, the Postmaster General shall certify the fact to the commission, which shall forthwith hold an open competitive examination to test the fitness of applicants to fill such vacancy, and when such examination has been held and the papers in connection therewith have been rated the said commission shall certify the result thereof to the Postmaster General, who shall submit to the President the name of the highest qualified eligible for appointment to fill such vacancy, unless it is established that the character or residence of such applicant disqualifies him for appointment. No person who has passed his sixty-fifth birthday shall be given the examination herein provided for.

(Signed)

WOODROW WILSON.

Dated MARCH 31, 1917.

List of post offices where former service men, or widows of such, have been nominated for postmasters and their nominations not confirmed; and names of nominees.

Post office.	State.	Nominee.
Guntersville.....	Alabama.....	Jasper L. Morrow.
Muscle Shoals.....	do.....	Gorman R. Jones.
Oneonta.....	do.....	John L. Etheridge.
Opp.....	do.....	Arnold R. Woodham.
Waverly.....	do.....	Robert L. Walton.
Wetumpka.....	do.....	Walter Gaines.
Jerome.....	Arizona.....	Ross H. Cunningham.
Benton.....	Arkansas.....	Herbert D. Edwards.
De Queen.....	do.....	James D. Bennett.
Mansfield.....	do.....	Claud B. McDonald.
Marvell.....	do.....	Clyde P. Noe.
Banning.....	California.....	William E. Mack.
Corning.....	do.....	Orvel Hatfield.
Hermosa Beach.....	do.....	Daniel S. Devine.
Manteca.....	do.....	Ernest Lee Milner.